



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



100-100000

KENOX &
FOUNDATION



CC
(L. 10. 10)
11. 11. 11

The Late Queen Victoria

0

LONDON

HISTORIC AND SOCIAL

BY
CLAUDE DE LA ROCHE FRANCIS

ILLUSTRATED

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

PHILADELPHIA
HENRY T. COATES & CO.
1902



COPYRIGHT,
HENRY T. COATES & CO.
1901.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY,	1
II. ROMAN LONDON,	16
III. SAXON LONDON,	42
IV. NORMAN LONDON,	87
V. LONDON UNDER THE PLANTAGENETS,	128
VI. LONDON UNDER LANCASTER AND YORK,	211
VII. LONDON UNDER THE TUDORS,	259
VIII. LONDON UNDER THE TUDORS (CONTINUED),	302
IX. LONDON UNDER THE STUARTS,	347

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME I

Photogravures made by GILBO & Co.

	PAGE
THE LATE QUEEN VICTORIA,	<i>Frontispiece.</i>
A "BEEF EATER," TOWER OF LONDON,	38
THE CROWN JEWELS, TOWER OF LONDON,	48
POST-OFFICE,	66
WESTMINSTER ABBEY,	82
TOWER OF LONDON,	92
THE ARMORY, TOWER OF LONDON,	98
TRAITOR'S GATE, TOWER OF LONDON,	102
INNER TEMPLE AND GARDEN,	120
CORONATION CHAIR, WESTMINSTER ABBEY,	130
SCREEN IN HENRY VII.'S CHAPEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY,	152
ELEANOR'S CROSS, CHARING CROSS,	170
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,	182
MIDDLE TEMPLE, HALL,	196
GUILD HALL,	216

	PAGE
LONDON BRIDGE,	234
BLOODY TOWER, TOWER OF LONDON,	252
NAVE, WESTMINSTER ABBEY,	272
ST. JAMES PALACE,	286
SOMERSET HOUSE,	304
TEMPLE BAR, REMOVED IN 1878,	322
HAMPTON COURT PALACE,	352
WINDSOR CASTLE, FROM THE THAMES,	380
MARBLE ARCH, HYDE PARK,	392

PREFACE.

IT is difficult to write without a certain emotion of the world's greatest metropolis. London has a history so varied, a past so majestic, a present so important, and a future so problematic that even in a partial and incomplete appreciation of so vast a subject all the emotions and well nigh all the resources of description and rhetoric could well be called into requisition. To trace, even in a most superficial manner, the history of this wonderful city from the remote antiquity in which its origin is buried, from those days to which are attributable the legends of Brutus, its hypothetical founder, of Belin and King Lud, down through the ages which have since expired, the Roman Occupation, the Saxon and Danish Monarchies, the Norman Period, the rule of the Plantagenets, the Tudors and the Stuarts, and that of the House of Brunswick; to give even the barest outline of its growth civic and architectural, an outline sufficient to create a picture of the manners and customs of each successive age, and at the same time convey an understanding of the political, the social and the intellectual life of the successive

periods, is in itself perhaps no unambitious task, and one but very imperfectly fulfilled in the following pages.

The superficial observer, the traveller passing through England's capital and according to it but the attention granted by the ordinary tourist, would assure you that he knew his London and had seen its sights in at most a fortnight or but somewhat longer period ; but he who knows London—as the student of its monuments, and more especially of its history, its traditions and its local lore, alone can know it—would tell you that a year of conscientious work was scarce sufficient to know London as it should be known. The surface view is, at times, not prepossessing. To those accustomed to the straight and splendid thoroughfares of modern capitals, the lack of symmetry in plan and, even more so, the lack of “vista,” so inevitable where streets curve, and no effort has been made to unite outlying districts by means of broad, straight avenues, are the first observable results of that method whereby London has been permitted to grow, as it were, unaided by a master plan, village after village being incorporated in the all-encroaching city, just as it was before absorption, and alterations only attempted when property has already become too valuable for improvement on extended scale. This, the result of the policy of deliberateness, so conspicuous in the political life of the nation, as well as in its civic development, though it may have proved disas-

trous to metropolitan unity, has had the ineffaceable advantage of leaving to each locality, to every incorporated village, its character, special and peculiar ; which makes London *de facto* what it is in municipal theory, an aggregation of small towns rather than one giant city. Nor is the climate and its permeating humidity blameless in the sombre aspect which has been given to things external. Penetrate, however, beneath the surface, discover the by-ways of London life, its hidden churches, its relics of the monastic age, its bits of mediæval architecture, its obscure squares and parkings, its street marts and those numerous hives of its lower industrial life, and arrive at a true understanding of its institutions, civic, social, commercial, and of the many interests of its tremendous and teeming populations, differing so widely in its several quarters, through racial and linguistic and ever-varying domestic problems, and London looms up before you with a majesty, a dignity, a splendor and an all-absorbing interest quite unknown to the West End sybarite or the passing traveller.

The kind courtesy of my publishers has enabled me through an additional grant of time to more effectually accomplish my task than otherwise I could have done. In the hope of rendering these studies more complete I have consulted most of the authorities by whom my subject has been already treated. Personal observation and special investigation of my own has done the rest. To the Rev. W. J. Loftie, B.A., F.S.A.,

the most conscientious exponent of London's historic life, I wish here to express my thanks for the valuable advantage derived from a close study of his work. These few remarks will be all, I trust, that are necessary to introduce the following pages to the esteem and consideration of an indulgent public.

C. DE LA ROCHE FRANCIS.

Thursday, July 25, 1901.

London, England.

LONDON.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The Story of Troy-Novant—Æneas the Ancestor of the Early British Kings—His Arrival in Latium—His Marriage to Lavinia—Discovery of Alba Longa by Ascanius—The Birth of Brutus—His Flight to Hellas—His Arrival in Albion—The Settlement of Britain—The Founding of New Troy—The Trojan Dynasty in Britain—Bledhud—King Lear and his Three Daughters—Dunwallo Molmutius Founds the Molmutian Dynasty—Belin, the Builder of Belin's Gate (Billingsgate)—King Lud, the Builder of Lud Gate (Ludgate)—Troy-Novant Becomes Kaër Lud—The First Invasion of the Romans—Tenuantius Effects a Peace with Cæsar—He Founds the Tenuantine Dynasty—Kymberline—The Legends of Lucius and the Early British Church—The Early British Tribes—London the Capital of the Trinobantes—London as the Romans Found It—The Thames—The Ford at Thorny Isle—The First London Bridge—Religion, Government and Customs of the British or Pre-Roman Period.

LIKE all famous cities, London had its legendary as well as its authentic history. The same desire for illustrious and far-distant ancestry which led the Greeks to seek descent from primeval gods caused the early Britons—or perhaps was it the later chroniclers?—to seek in mythic legends a noteworthy and distin-

guished origin, and it appears from these authorities that London, or as it is said to have first been called, *Troy-Novant* or New Troy, was founded by Brutus, grandson of the far-famed Æneas, Prince of Troy, and that Britain was settled by his followers. The tale is found in Geoffrey of Monmouth, who, in turn, claims to have taken it from an ancient manuscript "in the early British tongue," discovered by one Gualtier Mappes, Archdeacon of Oxford, who brought it to Geoffrey of Monmouth for him to translate and edit. Herein we read that on the fall of Troy, Æneas, a prince of the royal Trojan house, fled from the captured city and set sail towards the west, and, after adventures as various as they were extraordinary, landed in Latium on the Italian main; how he there married Lavinia, daughter of the king of that country, and how he became by her the progenitor of the early Alba Longan kings.

Of this journey much has been said by Diodorus in his history, which we find here repeated, with some added details, and Virgil in his great epic also enlarges on the voyage of Æneas, on his visit to Carthage and Syracuse, and his final settlement in Latium; and he, who was the author of Mappes' reputed manuscript, had doubtless knowledge of this source of poetic history. Be that as it may, he concurs with Livy in stating that by Lavinia Æneas became the father of a son, Ascanius by name, who, according to this authority, being too young on the death of his

father to assume the reins of government, started on a tour of foreign travel, like many a modern heir apparent, leaving his mother regent of the kingdom. Coming upon Alba Longa, he was so charmed, we are informed, by that country, that he refused to return to Latium, and settled there, where he was succeeded, as king, by his son, Sylvus Pandrasus, who had married a niece of Lavinia. Of this marriage was born a boy, Brutus by name, who, fulfilling the prophecy which had been made of him, killed his father on attaining his fifteenth year, and seeking refuge first in Hellas, made his way, after wondrous adventures and great escapes, to Albion, as Britain, a barren and unexplored island, was then called, where he and his followers established a colony and kingdom, calling the island Britain, after his own name, from which also his followers came to be called Britains, later corrupted to Britons.

He it was, we are told, who, in the same year, established his headquarters on the banks of that stream which is now known as the Thames, calling the settlement Troy-Novant, or Trinovantum—that is, New Troy, from whence, it is also related, was derived the name of the Trinobantes, by which the inhabitants of this portion of the isle of Albion were known when Cæsar first landed on British soil. The settlement is said to have retained its original name until centuries later, when Lud, the brother of Cassibellaun, “having waged successful war against the Romans, obtained the government of the kingdom”;

and, to quote again from the chronicle, "He surrounded it with stately towers of admirable workmanship, and ordered it to be called after his own name, Kaër Lud—that is, the town of Lud," which, by corruption, has become the London of to-day.

That the chain between the person of Brutus and the events just related, and the British chiefs found in the possession of authority on the entrance of the Romans, should not be broken, the chroniclers give us complete lists of kings, extending from the time of Brutus to that of the Roman invasion, and divide this royal line into three distinct dynasties and periods; thus we have the early British line, descended from the semi-mythic Trojans, the Molmutian and the Tenuantine dynasties, not to speak of the several lines of later Welsh kings.

It were apart from the purpose of this work to enter in detail into the legendary history of these mythic monarchs, nor yet would it seem appropriate to follow the example of the modern historians, who, in their desire to place the history of the city on an absolutely veracious basis, entirely ignore the early kings and commence their histories with the Roman occupation. It would, indeed, seem as if the more famous of these prehistoric chieftains—for chieftains, if they ever had any actual existence, they really were—should, by the conscientious chronicler, be accorded at least a passing mention in the annals of the city, for so many buildings, sites and places are held

to be associated with their names that student or traveller must feel himself at sea without a general notion of this legend lore.

Thus Bath, that far-famed watering-place and health resort, is said to have been founded by Bladud, otherwise spelled Bledhud, the tenth in the line of the early Trojan kings of Britain, while the story of his immediate successor in the royal line, King Lear and his three daughters, stands pre-eminent among the historic legends of the times, and has found an imperishable place in Shakespeare's immortal tragedy. With Gorbogudo, the nineteenth in line, the Trojan succession came to a close, and Dunwallo Molmutius, son of Cloten, Duke of Cornwall, seizing the reins of government, proclaimed himself monarch of the realm, and founded the so-called "Molmutian dynasty," which gave to Britain no less than forty-eight kings, of which the second, the immediate successor of Dunwallo himself, was the far-famed Belin, to whom the building of Belin's Gate (Billingsgate) has been attributed; while Lud, to whom legend has ascribed the building of the city walls and the opening of Ludgate, was the forty-seventh, and Cassibel-lann, during whose reign Cæsar's invasion took place, is said to have been the forty-eighth. Indeed it is, as we have seen, to Lud that the change of name from Trinovantum to Kaër Lud, or London, has been ascribed by the chroniclers, and thus has Lud been held by many to be the true founder of the city.

By the invasion of the Romans, the influence of Cassibellaun was seriously affected, and thus it is we learn that "Cæsar, being repulsed by Androgius, and having started for Rome to wage war against Pompey, Tenuantius, Duke of Cornwall, who, with Androgius, had been so greatly instrumental in effecting a peace between Cæsar and Cassibellaun, sprang into leadership, and, assuming the government, founded the third, or 'Tenuantine dynasty.'" His immediate successor was Kymberline, during whose reign the chroniclers assert that Christ, the Saviour of the world, was born in Bethlehem, and his story, like that of Lear, is immortalized by the Bard of Avon. .

The Tenuantine dynasty, we are further told, gave to Britain seven kings, of which the last, a certain Lucius, is said to have embraced Christianity, and to have died childless in A.D. 156. To him is ascribed the founding of St. Peter upon Cornhill—a romantic legend which we will examine into further and in its proper place. The story of his martyrdom at Chur (Coire), Switzerland, whither he had gone for purposes of religious controversy, is well known, and "his monument" there is still shown to the visitor. So much for the legendary history of British London previous to the first Roman invasion under Cæsar.

Whether or not any of this long line of legendary kings had any actual existence, they yet belong to the picture scheme of early British legend, and as such cannot be ignored. There may have been among the

early British chiefs a Bladud (Bledhud), a Lear, a Lud, and others of this legendary line, but the London of ante-Roman days could not have been what the pride of the chroniclers portray; for no monumental city stood then where London stands to-day. The London of the Britons could have been only what Cæsar, Tacitus and Strabo have described to us a British town as being—a mere collection of huts set down on a dry spot in the midst of a marsh, or in a cleared space in a wood, surrounded, in addition to these natural protections, by the artificial defences of a mound or ditch. Before we can, therefore, obtain a correct appreciation of what British London must have been, we should look into the origin of the inhabitants, consider their manners, understand their religion, their government and their mode of life; then and only then can the picture be complete.

Passing over those prehistoric races of which Europe was once the home, and of which the Basques in Southern France are probably the present representatives, that branch of the Indo-European race, called by certain ethnologists Mediterranean, may perhaps be best divided into two great divisions, the Ionian and the Kimmerians. The first of these include the Achæian and the Ombro Latins, who settled the Greek and Roman world, and the second the Kelts, the Teutons and the Slavs, by whom the rest of Europe came eventually to be settled. Of these, the Kelts were the first to cross the boundaries of Asia, and to estab-

lish themselves in Europe. The tide of population continuing, however, to roll westward, they were pushed forward by the advancing Teutons, who in turn yielded to the pressure of the advancing Slavs. At the dawn of European history we find the Kelts, however, in possession of a large part of Spain and the British Isles.

In Britain the population, we are told, consisted at the time of the first Roman invasion under Cæsar of about forty Keltic tribes, of which some, while they retained their original appellations, had been deprived of their independence. The long track of land south of the Thames was unequally divided among some ten nations, of which the principal were the Cantii, or men of Kent; the Belgæ, who inhabited the present counties of Hampshire and Wilts, and the Damnonii, who had extended themselves gradually from the river Ex to that western promontory now called Cornwall. Across that arm of sea which we know as the British Channel, the most potent tribe was that of the Silures, who had carried their arms from the banks of the Wye to the Dee and the ocean, and enforced their authority on the Ordovices and the Dimetæ, who inhabited the northern mountains and west district of Wales. On the eastern side, the island was divided between the Iceni, whose territory extended from Stour northward, including what is now Suffolk and Norfolk, to the banks of the Humber; the Brigantes, who were bounded on the south by the Humber and

on the north by the Tyne, and who had subdued the Volantii and the Sistuntii of the western coast. Further north still were the Macetoe, and beyond these again the Caledonii, who, scantily clad, wandered with savage ferocity amid the lakes and the mountains of the northern fastnesses.

The left bank of the upper Thames was under the rule of the Dobuni and the Cassii, united tribes; while the territory between the lower left bank of the Thames and the Stour was held by the Trinobantes, whose capital, as their name indicates, was Troy-Novant, or Trinovantum, afterwards Kaër Lud, or London.

While the greater proportion of the inhabitants, more particularly among the rude tribes of the interior, sowed no corn, and were clad only in skins, the southern Britons practiced agriculture, and wore cloth of their own manufacture. Their dress consisted of a sort of square mantle, which partly covered a vest, trousers and plaited tunic of braided cloth; the waist was encircled by a belt; a ring adorned the second finger of each hand, and a chain of iron or brass was suspended from the neck. Their huts resembled those of their Gallic neighbors. A foundation of stone supported a kind of circular structure of timber and reeds, over which was thrown a conical roof, pierced in the centre, for the twofold purpose of admitting the light and emitting the smoke. As we have already said, in husbandry they possessed considerable skill,

and had discovered the use of the marl as manure. They raised more corn than was necessary for their own consumption, and to preserve it until the following harvest they stored it in the cavities of the rocks.

Their principal commerce seems to have been with the Phœnicians, some of the more adventurous of whom braved the dangers of the open ocean, and, sailing from Spain and Carthage, brought their wares to the far distant shores of Britain, which they traded for tin; and thus did the islands come in those countries to be known as the Tin Islands, or Cassiterides. The religion of the early Britons was that of the Druids, and had been brought from Gaul, in all probability, by the earliest settlers. They thus worshipped gods similar in attributes to those of Græco-Roman mythology, though differing from them in name. Of the rites and ceremonies of the Druidic worship, some knowledge has descended to us. Their temples, usually groves of lofty oak trees, were the more immense from their lack of architectural confinement. At noon and at midnight, held to be the most propitious hours, sacrifices were celebrated with due solemnity. The trunk of one of the giants of the forest formed the altar on which the victim was bound, and its leaves the chaplets worn at the sacrifice. The fruits of the earth, the spoil of battle, the beasts of the field and forest, and sometimes, in times of dire distress and danger, the captive and the malefactor shared alike

the honor of being offered up in pious and prayerful adoration.

These rude people were held in control by a system of government partly patriarchal, partly sacerdotal. To the veneration which the British Druids inspired was added the respect which knowledge always inspires in the ignorant; and while the chiefs occupied the position of petty tribal kings, governing in all matters appertaining to warfare, the Druids, as the sacerdotal class, formed a kind of judiciary—administered justice and inflicted punishments—the execution of which remained to the military force at the disposal of the kings. Gradually it came to be that commerce, and the legal interests arising therefrom, drew men together, and thus a group of huts became a settlement, and a group of settlements a town. These towns, such as they were, were usually in sheltered positions, strategically desirable by reason of the natural protection afforded by an adjoining river and an adjacent forest, and rendered additionally safe by such rude artificial devices as mounds of earth and shallow ditches. Within such enclosures Strabo tells us that the inhabitants were accustomed to stall as many cattle as sufficed for a few months' consumption, and Cæsar relates that when the town or fastness of Cassivellaunus fell into his hands, he found in it a great number of cattle, which he intimates had been brought thither by the people when they came from all parts of the country to take refuge in that stronghold. It is prob-

able, however, that most of the cattle, in which we are informed the island abounded, still remained wild and unappropriated, wandering through the woods and pastures, and dividing the honors of the soil with the wild and savage population.

As regards London, we have positive knowledge, based on reliable authority, that, at a date many centuries later, over the area where London now extends a vast forest still covered the country, and extended some miles on either side of the river, and that a fen or lake of great extent—whence that part of the metropolis called Finsbury derives its name—lay on the northeast, close to the settlement. When it was a British town it probably occupied only the face and summit of the first natural elevation, ascending from the river and stretching between what is now the Tower, on the one hand, to Dowgate, near what is now Southwark Bridge, on the other, and going back no further than the line of the present Cornhill and Leadenhall Street. The Walbrook and the Sherbourne on the west, and the Lang Bourne on the north—though they had not acquired their later celebrity and were known neither by these, nor, in all probability, by any other names—and to the east the wide-spread marsh which long after continued to cover the low grounds, now occupied by the suburb of Wapping, furnished such natural boundaries as were usually sought by the founders of these early settlements.

There was, in all probability, a small settlement on the south bank of the river, access to which from the north bank was had by a ford near Westminster, by boat, and later by a primitive bridge, which was the remote predecessor of the London Bridge of to-day. That the river was first forded at Westminster may be deduced by one glance at the map, and a careful study of the topography of the adjoining country.

Many of the ancient roads, afterwards deflected and diverted by the Romans during their occupancy, according to a well-determined scheme, converged at a single point on the northern bank of the Thames. Some, indeed, after traversing the country for hundreds of miles in a perfectly straight line, turned aside in order to reach this point. The reason for this was, unquestionably, the desire to find the most advantageous place to effect a crossing of the river. The most desirable would, however, perforce depend upon the method of crossing to be employed. If the river were to be crossed by a bridge, naturally the deepest, because it was the narrowest place, would be the one selected; if by a ford, the widest, because it was the shallowest, would be preferred. While it is impossible to state at what time London Bridge was erected, as its building defies and antedates the memory of man, yet the presumption is that in the earliest times there was no bridge, and that the river was therefore crossed by a ford at the shallowest, and consequently the widest place.

This hypothesis is supported by the fact that in the earliest times of which knowledge has descended to us, the very ancient ways above referred to seem to have converged and joined each other at the site of the present Kilburn or St. John's Wood, followed what is now Edgware Road, and went on in a straight line, now slightly diverted by Park Lane, towards Westminster, where the road ran along a low ridge, now Tothill Fields, and so reached the Thames. This ancient way was that which led from Chester towards Dover, and came in Saxon times to be called the Watling Street. It was said to follow the course of the Milky Way, and the name was applied to both. On the Surrey bank, where St. Thomas' Hospital now stands, was a similar road, now Stangate or Stone Street—"the paved way"—which road sought at once the Surrey hills and so crossed to the southern coast. It is therefore more than probable that the Watling Street crossed the Thames by a ford at the place described.

Later, however, it being desired to erect a bridge, the narrowest place—a spot near St. Olave's Church—was selected, and, with the building of London Bridge, the Watling Street was deflected from its original course, with the result that the old road traversed the Roman city from Newgate, at its northwestern extremity, to Bridgegate, near its southeastern end. Authority for this statement is found in a copy of an old Saxon charter of King Edgar, in which we read

of a broad military road between St. Andrew's, Holborn and Tyburn. This road it was which connected the Watling Street, which came down Edgware Road, with the Watling Street which crossed the ancient city.

To the building of London Bridge the city owes not only its earliest prosperity, but also possibly its very existence, though the exact period at which it was built has, as we have said, not been ascertained. It is probable that the structure consisted at first of a series of small craft, firmly fastened together, over which a planking of some sort was laid; but that this floating construction, being found both precarious and unsafe, for it was substituted a more permanent structure, built of huge trees, laid low and bound together at the extremities, and over which a planking was also placed. This bridge was probably that which the Romans found, and which they rebuilt, as we shall see.

Such, then, was the condition and the size of London when Cæsar, prompted by a desire, as he puts it, to understand the political institutions of the island, know the number of its inhabitants and study their manner of warfare, and to obtain other useful information which might lead ultimately to the conquest of the island and the subjugation of its people, first entered Britain in 55 B.C., and by his invasion brought the "barbarians" and their island home into the pale of the civilized world.

CHAPTER II.

ROMAN LONDON.

Julius Cæsar invades Britain—Cassibellaun Surrenders—Kymberline—Second Roman Invasion of Britain under Aulus Plautius—Submission at Camalodunum—Defeat of Boadicea—Vespasian reduces the Brigantii—Julius Agricola, Prefect of Britain—Descent of the Caledonians—Hadrian arrives in Britain—Septimus Severus defeats Clodius Albinus—Constantius arrives in Britain—Death of Carausius—Constantius enters London—The Mythic Coël and his daughter Helena—London a Military Colony—A second London Bridge—Population of Roman London—The Roman Citadel, or Prætorium—The Basilica—The Great Roads—The Suburbs, Villas and Gardens—The Building of London Walls—The Introduction of Christianity into Roman Britain—The Legend of Lucius and the Founding of St. Peter upon Cornhill—His Death at Chur.

As we have seen, the first Roman invasion of Britain was conducted by Julius Cæsar in person in the year 55 B.C. It is, in fact, to the pen of this Roman general that we are indebted for our first knowledge of the island. We have seen in the preceding chapter in what condition he found the country and its inhabitants. Notwithstanding the superior training and military equipment of the Roman legions, to say that he met with success would, however, be to indulge in flattery as gross as that which

was usually the basic property of Roman triumphs. Though the ambush prepared by the British chieftains and their subsequent attack on the Roman camp failed, yet in view of the possible interruption of his communication with Gaul during the winter months, which would have left him without supplies or provisions on a foreign shore, Cæsar was quite willing to accept the illusory promise of submission from a few native chiefs, and he returned to Gaul after a stay in Britain of about three weeks. It is very apparent that he had little reason to boast of the success of his expedition. He therefore affects in his "Commentaries" to consider it merely in the light of a voyage of discovery. In Rome the mere invasion was, however, regarded as the forerunner of great victories, and a thanksgiving of twenty days was ordered, in consequence, by the Roman Senate.

The following winter was spent in great and active preparations, and in the spring of 54 B.C. a Roman army, consisting of five legions and two thousand cavalry, sailed from the coast of Gaul in a fleet of more than eight hundred ships. Before so formidable an armament, the Britons retired precipitately to the woods; the invaders landed without opposition, and Cæsar immediately set out in pursuit of the natives. While recalled the next day to the coast by the news of a disaster to the fleet, caused by a storm which had arisen and wrecked a number of the Roman ships, the

damage was soon overcome, the remaining ships dragged up beyond the reach of the tide, and the expedition into the interior was resumed with energy.

Each day was marked by some encounter, in which the natives not infrequently obtained the advantage. It was their policy to shun any general encounter in the open and to depend on ambush and strategy—always the resort of the weaker power. When confronted, however, they showed no lack of courage. Their principal warriors fought in chariots, and the consummate skill with which they guided these cumbersome machines—on the brink of precipice, hillside and level plain alike—extorted the applause of the Romans themselves. No danger appalled them. Driving fearlessly along the Roman line, they took and profited by every opportunity to break the Roman ranks, but, when despairing of success, retired with rapidity. It required all the art at Cæsar's command to inflict any permanent injury on so active a foe ; but the occasion finally came about, and in consequence, the British forces being defeated, most of the confederate chieftains fled into the interior, leaving on Cassibellaun, king of the Cassii and chief of the allies, the whole burden of the war.

Repeated success at arms over neighboring tribes had caused Cassibellaun, who is said to have been the younger brother of the mythical Lud, to acquire high renown and ascendancy over the whole country. The Cassii, with the Dobuni, were themselves established

on the left or northern bank of the upper Thames, and the influence of Cassibellaun, their chief, had come to be distinctly recognized by the Trinobantes, who occupied the left bank of the lower Thames and whose chief seat, as we have seen, was London. The tribes on the right or southern bank of the Thames had also invited him to place himself at their head, and thus it came to be that he held a position closely resembling that held some centuries later by Egberht of Wessex, who, having subjugated the kings of the Heptarchy, annexed their territory and made himself master of all England. The fact that it was the Trinobantes, and not the Cassii themselves, of whom London was the chief seat, and that Cassibellaun was king of the Cassii and not of the first-named tribe, would seem of itself to dispose of the mythical story of Lud, from whom Cassibellaun has been said to have inherited his kingship.

Be this as it may, Cassibellaun had attained a degree of authority over all the tribes of the district, which practically made him king of the whole country, and he had established his headquarters, it would seem, in London as presenting the best strategical advantages. When the Romans advanced, he retreated, ordering a spiked palisade to be erected at the only ford of the river; but the Romans were not to be retarded in their march northward by any artificial obstacles, and both cavalry and infantry managed to get across. The king of the Cassii, neverthe-

less, was not to be discouraged. He ordered the habitations to be burned, the cattle driven away and the territory laid waste. This caused great anger among the Trinobantes, who, with other neighboring tribes, now sought the protection of Cæsar, and led him to the final retreat of Cassibellaun, situated on the spot where afterwards Verulam was built and near to the site of the present town of St. Albans. The defences, excellent though they were, were soon forced by the Romans, and Cassibellaun was at length obliged to sue for peace. The result was an agreement whereby Rome was to receive an annual tribute from Britain and by which the commercial relations of the two nations were fixed. Yet Rome remained master of not even a foot of British soil.

From that period to the reign of Claudius, during a lapse of ninety-seven years, the British retained their original independence. Civil discord concentrated the attention of the Roman world upon itself. Britain was therefore left in peace. In this interval, we are told that two kings rose in turn to the position of chief of the allies, and were practically the sole sovereigns of the realm—Tenuantius and Kymberline, of whom mention has been made in the preceding chapter. During this time Britain was only nominally a tributary state. Augustus three times announced his intention of annexing Britain to the empire, but a submissive embassy from the native chiefs appeased and satisfied the imperial pride and postponed the fulfill-

ment of the plan. Instead of exacting the tribute imposed by Cæsar, he contented himself with imposing duties on the trade between Gaul and Britain. Tiberius, pretending that the empire was already too extensive, excused himself thus for his inaction in the matter; and while his nephew, Caligula, indulged at Boulogne, then Gesoriacum, in a triumph over his imaginary conquest of the ocean, yet nothing was achieved towards the actual conquest of the island and subjugation of the British until Claudius donned the imperial purple.

Instigated by Beric, a British chieftain, whom internecine feuds had driven from his country, Claudius commanded Aulus Plautius to transport four legions, with their auxiliaries, to Britain. It was with no small difficulty that the troops could be persuaded to embark on the expedition; but as they crossed the channel a meteor, moving in the direction of the fleet, was seen, and held to be an augury of success.

The two sons of Kymberline, whom Roman historians call Caractacus and Togidumnus, but whom British chroniclers denominate Guiderus and Arviragus, led the British forces, and, adopting the policy of Cassibellaun, endeavored to harass rather than openly repel the adversaries. The German auxiliaries, better fitted for such warfare than the Roman legionary soldiers, followed the Britons, however, across rivers and morasses, and, though the latter made a brave resistance, drove them across the Thames

to the northern bank. The emperor himself, now taking command, penetrated as far as Camalodunum, now called Colchester, and received the submission of the natives.

Claudius, before his departure from the islands, placed the Roman forces under Plautius and Vespasian, an officer whose merits afterwards won for him the imperial dignity. Plautius was given the left bank of the Thames, in which division London was situated, while to Vespasian was assigned the right bank of the river. In order to repress the inroads of the northern tribes, he caused two chains of forts to be erected, one in the north, along the river Avon, the other in the south, along the banks of the Severn. Thus the subdued territory was gradually moulded into a Roman province, and when the Iceni attempted to throw off the Roman yoke their rebellion was severely punished.

Ostorius Scapula was the successor of Plautius, and was in turn succeeded as Roman legate by Aulus Didius, who was followed by Veranius, an officer whose early death made way for Suetonius Paulinus, and it was during the latter's absence in Anglesey, whither he marched to give a final blow to Druidic power, that Catus, the Roman procurator, seized on the patrimony of Prasutagus, king of the Iceni, while Boadicea, the widow of the late king, was scourged as a slave and the chastity of her daughter violated by Roman officers.

Boadicea naturally took the first opportunity for revenge, and soon a formidable rebellion against Roman authority was in progress—in the course of which Camalodunum (Colchester) and later London, which had grown under Roman rule to be a populous and open mart, and also the town of Verulam, experienced sieges and suffered serious damage from battle and plunder. Suetonius, who had retired before the advancing fury, was finally obliged to turn and face the enemy. The final battle was terrible in all its details. The Britons were collected in masses around their various chieftains, their wives and children occupied a long line of carts and carriages in the rear, and the air resounded with their shrieks and imprecations. The Romans, who stood motionless and silent, permitted the Britons to approach, and then, rushing forward in the form of a wedge, overturned and scattered everything within reach. The losses on both sides are variously estimated at between seventy and eighty thousand, and Tacitus is certainly justified in comparing this with the greatest former victories of the Romans. Completely conquered, the surviving Britons took flight, and Boadicea, who had led them to battle, determined not to outlive so terrible a catastrophe, and ended her misfortunes by a violent and voluntary death.

If the splendor of the victory preserved the prestige of the Roman arms, it did not end the war, and Rome, fearing that the determined obstinacy of the

Britons was due to the too great severity of Suetonius Paulinus, he was recalled, and under his three successors, Turpilianus, Trebellius and Bolanus, the Britons, within the pale of the Roman forts, were gradually subdued and made to submit to the Roman yoke. No effort was made, however, to reduce that portion of Britain which lay beyond the Roman forts. When Vespasian assumed the imperial purple, he commanded Petilius Cerealis to reduce the Brigantii. This was done, and Julius Frontinus, who succeeded Petilius as governor of the province of Britain, added the territory of the Silurii to the confines of the empire. The great merits of these generals were obscured, nevertheless, by the greater fame of the successor of Frontinus—that is, Julius Agricola.

When that commander arrived the army, which had been dismissed and was in its winter quarters, was immediately summoned by him into the field, and led against the unsubmissive Ordovicii, whom he completely subjugated. In his next two campaigns he extended the limits of the empire to the banks of the Tay. Tribe after tribe was forced to submit, and a line of forts from the frith of Forth to that of the Clyde, constructed in the fourth year of his command, protected the province of Britain from the inroads of the northern barbarians. Later, however, having received the submission of the tribes in the neighborhood of the Forth, Agricola pushed his conquests along the eastern shore. His final expedition was

against the Caledonians, in the eighth year of his command ; but while a victory for Roman arms was the outcome, the results, as far as retention of territory was concerned, were not permanent.

The Roman power seemed now firmly established throughout the island. The tribes who had submitted made no attempt to recover their independence, and the Caledonians, temporarily humbled by their last defeat, were content to roam about unmolested and unmolested in their native forests. Agricola, if he obtained fame as a subjugator of rebellious people, deserves even greater credit for the impetus which he gave to the development of the country in the arts of peace. The successors of Agricola followed in this his example, and devoted themselves to promoting public tranquillity, protecting commerce and enforcing the laws ; but, though they possessed a certain spark of his genius as regards the organization and encouragement of the peaceful arts, they fell far short of his military talent. Hardly, therefore, had he taken his departure, than the Caledonians, whom he had merely temporarily checked in their career, commenced again to attack the majesty of Rome. Crossing the line of forts between the two friths, they succeeded by their example in rekindling the flame of rebellion, and in arousing again the independent spirit of the subdued tribes. By the time that Hadrian ascended the throne, the condition of affairs had become so serious that he considered it necessary to

appear himself in Britain. Whatever tranquillity he may have succeeded in establishing was again disturbed during the reign of his successor Antoninus, who appointed Lollius Urbicus prefect of Britain. Hostilities between the Caledonians and the Romans became now a matter of constant occurrence, and during the reign of Marcus Aurelius assumed truly imposing and threatening proportions.

Ulpus Marcellus, having been made prefect of Britain, succeeded, however, in once more restoring peace. The command was next conferred on Clodius Albinus, and was retained by him through the remainder of the reign of Commodus, and also through the reigns of Pertinax and Julian, while he received from Septimus Severus, who succeeded the latter of these, the rank of Cæsar, with the result that the two were finally brought into a conflict for authority. The battle was fought in Gaul, and the victory remaining with Severus, he caused Albinus to be beheaded, and to prevent in the future such great increase in power in the prefects of Britain, he divided the island into two commands, bestowing one on Heracianus and the other on Virus Lupus.

His presence having become necessary in Britain, Septimus Severus, notwithstanding his advanced years, undertook the long journey, accompanied by his two sons, Caracalla and Geta, and himself led the expedition from York against the Caledonians. After his death at York a silence occurs in the his-

tory of Britain for some seventy years. We may assume therefore that these years were peaceful, or at least uneventful. Internecine warfare and civil strife had done so much by that time to disintegrate the forces of the empire, and to injure Roman prestige abroad, that the Britons, encouraged by the possibility of success, began again their attempt to regain their independence. To chastise and restrain their insubordination, the command of a great fleet, with the title of Count of the Saxon Shore, was accorded to Carausius by Diocletian and Maximilianus. The way in which he fulfilled his trust is well known. Having induced both the army and the fleet to espouse his cause, and having made a truce with the barbarians, he assumed the imperial dignity himself and set defiance to Rome.

It is of course scarcely to be supposed that the two emperors would acquiesce in such a usurpation. They entrusted to Constantius, accordingly, the task of wresting Britain from the hands of Carausius, and as he made his residence at Boulogne, it was here that Constantius commenced his attack. Retiring to Britain, Carausius made a bold defence of what he claimed as his rights, but while still unconquered by the legion of Constantius, he fell a victim to domestic treachery, being murdered at York, in the eighth year of his reign, by Allectus, a general who, having abused his confidence, feared his resentment. Allectus now assumed the crown himself, and made his

capital at Clausentum, near the present site of Southampton. Constantius, in the meantime, was collecting a powerful fleet, which he divided into two squadrons, keeping one at Boulogne under his own command, while he placed the other at the mouth of the Seine, under Asclepiodotus, who had been prefect of Britain. This second squadron it was which put forth first, and effected a landing on the southern coast, near the Isle of Wight. Constantius, with the first squadron, made for the coast of Kent, and on landing learned of the defeat and death of Allectus, who had been overcome by the superior forces of Asclepiodotus. Nor was this the only piece of good fortune which befell Constantius, for a portion of his squadron, having become separated from his command, entered the Thames, and advanced without opposition as far as London. The city, which was on the point of being plundered by a band of auxiliaries, once in the pay of Allectus, was saved from this impending fate by the arrival of the Romans, and Constantius himself was on his entry hailed as liberator and deliverer, and proclaimed emperor; but he did not long survive this new honor, for he was shortly after taken ill at York, which city he had selected as his residence because of its better strategical qualities, and died—this being in A.D. 306.

According to the chroniclers, he had married a certain Helena, a daughter of the British chief or king,

Coëlgodebog; while Gibbon and other historians of note make her out to have been a native of Bithynia, and of humble origin. Whatever may be the truth concerning her parentage, all must deplore her fate, as Constantius, on attaining the rank of Cæsar, repudiated her for Theodora, daughter-in-law of Maximianus. Helena had, however, already borne him a son in the person of the famous Constantine, a prince who, by his efforts and his victories, united again the entire empire under his sole rule, and by so doing, and re-establishing the prestige of the imperial authority, restored peace to the empire and the provinces, a condition of affairs which lasted during his reign and that of his sons, and from which Britain was not the last to benefit.

Let us now turn our attention to the position which London occupied at this time, and to do this we must first glance briefly over the whole system of the Roman occupation, in regard to the respective status of its military posts and civil settlements. Throughout the country were scattered a large number of civil settlements and military posts, the names of which are preserved to us in the itineraries of Richard and Antoninus. Some were of British, some of Roman origin, and they were divided into four classes, gradually descending in the scale of privilege and importance. The first rank may, perhaps, be said to have been held by the municipal cities, the inhabitants of which enjoyed the rank of Roman citizens, possessed the

right of choosing their own decurions, or magistrates, and enacting their own laws, and were exempt from the operations of imperial statutes. Privileges so exceptional were granted with great reserve, and at first Britain could boast of only two so-called municipal cities, Verulam and York. The "*Jus Latii*," or Latin right, as it was called, conferring, as it did, privileges more partial in their nature, was conferred with greater frequency, and was enjoyed by ten British towns, namely: Inverness, Perth, Dunbarton, Carlisle, Catterick, Blackrode, Cirencester, Salisbury, Caister in Lincolnshire, and Slack in Longwood. These also selected their own magistrates, who resigned at the expiration of the year, and claimed upon retirement that privilege which was the height of all provincial ambition, the freedom of Rome.

Thirdly, but not necessarily of less dignity, were the so-called colonies, each of which was, as it were, a miniature representation of its parent city, adopting, as it did, the same customs, and being governed by the same laws. In Britain there were nine of these establishments, two of a civil and seven of a military character. These were namely: Richborough, London, Colchester, Bath, Gloucester, Caerleon, Chester, Lincoln and Chesterfield. It had long been the policy of Rome to reward her veterans with gifts of land, portioned out of that of the conquered nation, and, in return, it exacted from the beneficiary strict allegiance and specific services. Thus we find a great similitude

to the feudal tenure of the Middle Ages in the constitution of the Roman colonial establishments. While military service was not exacted of the veteran himself, he was expected to enlist his sons in the army as soon as they attained to years of manhood; and if they refused to be enlisted, disgrace and imprisonment, sometimes even death, was the resulting punishment.

There were, besides the three classes already enumerated, a fourth class of towns which were stipendiary—that is, compelled, as is indicated by the term, to pay tribute—and which were governed by Roman officers appointed by the prætor.

With the gradual abolition of class distinctions between the towns, which, commencing under Caracalla, continued till all distinctions were practically obliterated, and the freedom of Rome extended to the whole body of the citizens, those towns of greater commercial importance rose speedily to positions of dominant wealth and power, and London itself came to occupy a place of high importance. It had, in fact, by this time become a large and prosperous mart. To the settlement of primitive British huts had succeeded a stone-built Roman city, surrounded by an endless perspective of villas and gardens. It was a point of departure for all commercial expeditions, and held important relations with all the towns of the interior, whether to the north or south. The needs of such a city demanded far greater transfluvial communication

than was afforded by the primitive bridge, the construction of which had been accomplished by the early Britons; hence a new and more important bridge over the Thames was erected. This bridge seems to have consisted of great beams, founded on piles, over which a firm and substantial flooring was laid. This flooring was, however, in all probability not perfectly joined, and the discovery of a continuous series of coins, ranging from the early republican period to that of Honorius, found in the river when the old foundations which had served for the mediæval bridge were taken up, to make way for the foundations of the present structure (which coins, it is supposed, were used, or rather intended, for toll-paying, and must have accidentally slipped through the gaping boards into the stream beneath, or been deliberately thrown in as propitiatory offerings to the gods of the river), gives rise to the theory that the Roman bridge was in existence before the republican coins went out of use.

It is to Tacitus that we owe the first distinct mention of London by name. He tells us that Augusta, as London was called during the Roman occupation, was inhabited by merchants, but was nevertheless undefended by ramparts, which goes to show that, although it was a town of commercial importance, it held evidently an inconsiderable place in military significance. From its abandonment by Suetonius, at the time of the rising of the Iceni under Boadicea, it may be inferred that, while filled with Roman mer-

chants, it was not exactly a Roman colony, and was therefore not worth the risk of defending it against the enemy. And the risk must, indeed, have been great, since Tacitus remarks that all those who, on account of unwarlike sex or old age, remained in London were brutally slain. Indeed, as late as the days of Constantius, we find that emperor selecting York as his imperial residence because of its greater military protection.

As to the size of London it is difficult to make a proper estimate. Verulam, Camalodunum and London, taken together, contained, we are told, a population of about seventy thousand souls at the time of the massacre, from which, doubtless, many escaped; and it has been sometimes assumed that London alone probably contained some thirty thousand souls. After the mention made by Tacitus, no mention of London occurs from the pen of any Roman author for some two centuries. It is necessary to turn therefore to the result of excavations and other similar investigations to throw some light upon the subject.

While at first it would seem as though the Romans had not sufficiently appreciated the opportunities which London presented strategically, as well as commercially, and had only a small fortified town here, consisting of a fort or citadel, commanding the bridge and connected probably with another fort at Southwark, of two ports or docks, one at Billingsgate and another at Dowgate, and of a ring of suburbs, yet it

was not long before they came to recognize these advantages, and, after the rising and subjugation of the Iceni, it soon became both a populous and wealthy town.

Of the Roman buildings it is possible to form only an approximate idea. They were doubtless like all Roman buildings of the period. There are Roman forts and castles still standing in various countries, from a knowledge of which we can without much difficulty reconstruct those remains of Roman buildings, both municipal and private, which have been from time to time unearthed in the reconstruction of different parts of the city. London was then, as it has remained to the present day, a city of suburbs. The Roman garrison, which through the first two centuries of Roman occupation could not have been large, was confined to the citadel, around and outside of which were grouped suburban villas and private residences. The citadel itself must, however, have been a vast construction. It has long been believed, and recent investigation has proved, that it occupied a site which can best be defined as extending from Walbrook Street to Mincing Lane, and having its northern boundary where Lombard Street now is, and its water front on what is now the line of Upper and Lower Thames Street. To the west, the fortress rose to towering heights from the banks of the Walbrook itself, while to the north and east it was defended by ditches filled with water. The walls of the *prætorium*,

as a Roman citadel was called, must have been enormously massive, but have, nevertheless, almost entirely disappeared—the construction of the Cannon Street terminus having destroyed the great southwestern bastion, and a vast portion of the eastern wall, which was recently exposed to view in Mincing Lane, having also disappeared under modern constructions.

Within the fortress, near the western wall, and therefore near where the Cannon Street terminus now stands, was a large hall or basilica-like structure, with tessellated pavement, and which contained within its walls the residences of the governor and the Courts of Justice. With the exception of this and a Roman bath, near where the church of St. Magnus now stands, there is no existing trace of any large building within the walls of the citadel—no amphitheatre, no great temple—from which we may assume that, up to the middle of the third century, the military force in London was not large, and was confined absolutely within the fortifications and apart from the mercantile and native population of the suburbs.

Two great streets, known in Saxon times as the Watling Street and the Eormen or Ermyn Way, traversed the city and the citadel (the former coming from the northwest and the latter directly from the north), and meeting at the market-place, which came to be called East Cheap and still retains the name, led to the bridge. Here, where to-day crowded omnibuses, drays and private carriages roll on their vari-

ous and multifarious errands, the dark-skinned slaves were sold to British merchants in exchange for children of the north, who, by their fair skins and blue eyes, had attracted the attention of Roman officials.

Outside the fortress, on the west, as has been previously stated, was the Walbrook (Wallbrook). The course of this stream turned at the northwestern bastion, and lay then in a northeasterly direction. Close to this turn was evidently some kind of bridge, over which, through what was probably a stately gate, the Watling Street crossed to the other side, known as Dowgate side, where the finding of the remains of rude buildings has given rise to the theory that on the heights on that side there existed, in very early times, a fishing village. The banks of the Walbrook were studded with villas and suburban residences, which stretched far in the direction of Threadneedle Street, Cornhill and Bishopsgate. It is about here that the finest remains have been discovered, some covered with thick layers of black ashes, indicating the fragile character of wooden houses and the frequency of destructive fires. Here, in their gardens, the society of the day talked and gossiped while partaking of the delicacies of the period ; and where Threadneedle Street now witnesses the business bustle of the world's greatest metropolis, then languishing lovers rowed on the moonlit, rippling waters of the Walbrook or gathered flowers on its grassy banks.

Such was the London of the Romans for at least

two-thirds of the Roman occupation, for it was not until after Carausius had paid for his treachery with his life, Allectus had paid for his assumptions by his defeat, and Asclepiodotus had won for Constantius a decisive victory over the latter, that London became in truth a fortified city, and that walls were built which completely encircled the suburbs and the town.

Thus it came to be that that network of villas, orchards and cemeteries, which had surrounded the Roman citadel, became itself surrounded by the Roman wall. That this had not taken place when Constantius landed is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the hearty welcome which he received from the people, he preferred to make York, a fortified town, his headquarters.

Though the building of the walls, which still, in a certain sense, define the city boundaries, is, in the history of the city, an event second to none save the building of the bridge, yet no account of it has descended to us, nor have the most recent researches thrown light on this most important subject. All that is definitely known is, that in 350 A.D. London had no walls and that in 369 A.D. the walls existed. The walls, which resembled those of other Roman cities, were built with alternate layers of stone and brick. It extended along the river front from Blackfriars to the Tower, and in its other boundaries it followed the Fleet from the Thames to Ludgate Hill, there deflecting eastward, and a little further taking

A "Beef Eater," Tower of London

again a northerly direction, to where Newgate allowed the Watling Street to emerge from the city, which great highway crossed the Fleet at Holborn Viaduct. From there it turned again, taking a northeasterly direction between where St. Bartholomew's Hospital and Christ Hospital now stand, forming an angle where Aldersgate was subsequently made, and turning north again for a short distance, and then east to Bishopsgate—the second great land gate of the city, which gave egress to the Ermyrn Way. Then, slanting in a southeasterly direction and passing that place where Aldgate was opened at a later time, it reached the Thames at the exact spot where the White Tower stands to-day.

On the river front the wall was broken in three places—at Dowgate, where was the mouth of the Walbrook and where the southwestern bastion of the Roman citadel still stood; at Bridgegate, at the foot of London Bridge, and again a little to the eastward of the last mentioned and to the westward of the Tower, at Billingsgate, where that famous market now stands, and where, according to tradition, one may expect to hear that delicate vernacular of the fishwife which bears its name. The road from the bridge divided at East Cheap, the Watling Street pursuing a northwesterly course to Newgate, while the Ermyrn Way pursued an absolutely northerly course, in a line parallel with the present Gracechurch Street, by Cornhill—which name probably denotes the rural con-

dition in which the Saxons found it—and out of Bishopsgate to Lincoln and York.

Though London had become a city of not only commercial but also strategical importance, it was nevertheless smaller than either Verulam or York, and does not seem to have possessed any buildings of public interest save the so-called basilica, already referred to, which part of the citadel or *prætorium* has been described. As we have said, there was neither amphitheatre nor temple really worthy of the name. There was for many centuries a tradition that a temple dedicated to Diana had once stood on the site of St. Paul's, for the remains of which Sir Christopher Wren made search when building the foundations of that tremendous edifice. He might certainly have spared himself the trouble, for when the site of St. Paul's was first brought within the city limits by the building of the wall, the dynasty of Constantine, a Christian emperor, occupied the throne of the *Cæsars*, and it is hardly probable, even though paganism was not yet extinct, that a new edifice devoted to pagan worship should have been erected; nor is it consistent with our knowledge of Roman methods and manners to admit the possibility of the existence of such a temple, in so unprotected a position, outside the city walls. The fragments of stone pavement brought to light by mediæval excavations, and which at the time of their disinterment were supposed to be the remains of such a temple, are now, by the light of recent

excavations, considered more probably to be the remains of a tessellated terrace pavement once belonging to the suburban villas which in the Roman days lined the banks of the Walbrook.

London, or Augusta, as the Roman city was called, was, at the time of the building of the walls, to all intents and purposes, a Christian city, though if there is lacking evidence of the existence of any pagan temple within its walls, yet is there none of the presence, up to the time of Constantine, of any place of Christian worship or burial within this area. In view of the exceedingly scant material which we have from which to draw our conclusions, it is in fact very difficult at this distant day to say at what time and by whom Christianity was first preached in Britain, and when it first came to be generally adopted.

The story that St. Peter or St. Paul personally appeared in Britain, and preached there the gospel of salvation, cannot be said to rest on any acceptable historical evidence, and if Christianity did exist at all in the early Roman days, it was known and accepted but by a very few, and first appeared in an open and recognized form under Constantine, the son of Constantius, and the first Christian emperor. It is related by some that Pomponia Græcina, the wife of the proconsul Aulus Plautius the first, who, it will be remembered, made a permanent conquest of Britain, and Claudia, the British wife of the Senator Pudens, were Christians, and were potent factors in the early

Christianizing of Britain. It is also possible that the authority conferred by Claudius on Cogidimus, having continued in his family, Lucius—who was one of his near descendants, and who was in truth not king, but merely one of the petty chieftains of Britain, and as such probably a refugee in the highlands of the interior—was also a supporter of the gospels, and sent Fagan and Dervan to Rome as ambassadors to Pope Eleutherius, to receive ordination from him, and that on their return by their preaching they were instrumental in sowing the seeds of Christian worship on British soil; yet the legend of King Lucius, his founding of St. Peter upon Cornhill, and his subsequent journey to Chur in the cause of theological controversy, must, like the fables of Lear and of Lud, be relegated to historical oblivion.

CHAPTER III.

SAXON LONDON.

Decline of Roman Power in Britain—Arrival of Hengist and Horsa—The Heptarchy—Saxon Influence on London Names—The Watling Street—The Ermyrn Way—Arrival of St. Augustin of Canterbury—Conversion of Æthelberht—Building of St. Paul's—Mellitus first Bishop of London—All Hallows (Barking)—Erkenwald—Bishopsgate—New Gate—Lud Gate—Alders Gate—Cripple Gate—Moor Gate—Ald Gate—St. Peter's (Thorny Isle)—St. Gregory by St. Paul's—St. Faith's—St. Peter upon Cornhill—St. Martins-le-Grand—St. Andrew's Undershaft—St. Æthelburgha—St. Osyth—St. Botolph (London Bridge)—St. Botolph (Bishopsgate)—St. Botolph (Aldersgate)—St. Michael upon Cornhill—St. Dunstan in the East—St. Magnus the Martyr—St. Stephen (Walbrook)—St. Swithin (London Stone)—St. Mary (Aldermary)—St. Mary Magdalene—St. Mary (Somerset)—St. Peter (West Cheap)—St. Mary (Bothaw)—St. Peter (Paul's Wharf)—Holy Trinity the Less—Egberht—Alfred the Great—The Danish Occupation—St. Olave (Hart Street)—St. Olave (Jewry)—St. Olave (Silver Street)—St. Edmund the King and Martyr—The Saxon Restoration—Æthelred—Edward the Confessor—Westminster Abbey—The City Life—West Cheap—East Cheap—The Dawn of the Trade Guilds—Customs and Manners of the Saxon Period.

THE Roman power in Britain was now, however, nearing the final end. Under Julian, the Picts and the Scots, who had hitherto been classed by the Roman writers as Caledonians, emerged from the

barbaric obscurity to which the unsubjugated tribes had been relegated, and distinguished themselves by frequent inroads into Roman territory. So formidable were their expeditions that Lupicinus, who was sent by Julian to subjugate them, did not dare to meet them in the open, a confession of weakness which greatly encouraged their audacity.

During the reign of Valentinian I. things went from bad to worse, and became even more alarming, and depredations continued. The empire was now divided; Valens occupied the throne of the Eastern empire, and Valentinian that of the Western empire. Theodosius the Elder, on being sent to Britain by the latter to restore order, succeeded in part in his undertaking. Gratian succeeded his father Valentinian I., and was in turn succeeded by Valentinian II. Meanwhile the rise of Maximus in Britain had brought about other complications. The murder of Gratian gave him possession of Gaul, and the hurried flight of Valentinian transferred the greater part of Italy to his control. Theodosius the Younger, son of the "deliverer of Britain," to whom Gratian had accorded imperial honors and the throne of the Eastern empire, appearing now on the scene, gave the first shock to the power of Maximus, and the latter, being shortly after stripped of his imperial ornaments, was beheaded by his victor, leaving the Roman empire once more united under the now undivided rule of Theodosius.

During all this confusion Roman authority in Britain was an authority in name only. The Picts and the Scots, those formidable rivals of Roman rule, were not unmindful of their opportunities. Their constant depredations compelled the Britons to petition for succor from the imperial court, and Stilicho was dispatched to their assistance with a strong body of troops, and succeeded for the time being in repelling the invaders, and in confining them to the unannexed territories. But the mighty edifice of Roman power was now tottering to its fall. Hordes of barbarians broke through the barriers of the Empire in every direction, issuing from the unknown regions of the north and east, and devastating the most prosperous provinces.

The Goths and the Vandals, under the terrible Alaric, had, from the Julian Alps, pressed down on the fertile plains of the Italian peninsula. It was found imperative therefore to recall the troops from the extremities of the empire to defend the seat of power, and among those to be recalled the British troops were not the least important. Britain, now unprotected and left to its own devices, was the scene of terrible civil strife, and was victimized by terrific inroads by the Picts and Scots. Unable to assist them, the unfortunate Honorius, from his palace at Ravenna, authorized them to defend themselves as best they could—an order which has been construed by some as having released them from their allegiance.

Innumerable petty British chieftains now arose in every direction, and ferocious war was waged amongst them. Some appealed for protection to Ætius, the Roman general in Gaul; others sought the leadership of the famous Vortigern, the most powerful of the British chiefs, and following the example of the Roman emperors, who had often had recourse to the hiring of menials in their fights against the British, Vortigern and his allies made overtures to two Saxon chiefs, the brothers Hengist and Horsa, to aid them in their battles and share with them the spoils. These worthies landed at Ebbsfleet in the year A.D. 449, and were quartered in the Isle of Thanet.

How, from having been in the beginning merely the paid auxiliaries of the chief of the British forces and his allies, the Saxons, after having aided in driving the Picts and the Scots back to their old boundaries, turned on the British themselves, and, having defeated Vortigern, and subsequently the other chiefs, possessed themselves of the greater part of Britain, are matters of common knowledge. Thus came about the establishment of the kingdom of Kent by Hengist in A.D. 455. The success of Hengist stimulated the ambition of other Saxon chiefs, and his example was soon followed. The landing of Ælla at Cymensore, near Withering, in the Isle of Selsey, and the founding by him of the kingdom of Sussex in A.D. 489; the arrival of Cerdic and the founding by him of the kingdom of Wessex in 519; the founding of

the kingdom of Essex by Erkenwin in 527, and that of East Anglia by Uffa in 540; the fortifying of Bebanburgh Castle by Ida in 547, and the establishment by him of the kingdom of Bernicia in the same year, with its attendant developments—namely, the founding of the kingdom of Deira by Ælla in 560, and that of Mercia by Creoda in 586—these are events which belong to the history of England and the English people, but which have but indirect bearing on the development and history of England's great metropolis.

It is necessary, however, to understand the division into which Britain had fallen at the time of which we write, when the fame of the world's greatest city was dawning in the beginnings of Saxon London. Eight kingdoms had been carved by the barbarians out of the Roman province of Britain; Kent and Sussex comprised only the territory included by the modern counties of these names; East Anglia comprehended Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge and the Isle of Ely; Bernicia and Deira, when they attained their fullest development, extended from the Forth on the north to the Humber on the south, and from the eastern to the western coast; Wessex was bounded by the Thames and the Severn on the north, and stretched from the borders of Kent and Sussex to Land's End in Cornwall; Mercia comprised the interior of the island as far as Wales, and Essex, to us the most important, included the south of Hertfordshire, the modern

county of Essex and Middlesex, in which London itself was situated.

If we alluded in the last chapter to the extreme meagreness of the data which we have at our disposal, from which to work up an account of Roman London, we can but deplore in even stronger terms the greater meagreness which exists in the data which has descended to us as our heritage of Saxon London. The Roman legions were withdrawn from London in A.D. 410. We find the East Saxons in London in A.D. 609. Between these dates we have no knowledge of the city. Eventful though these intervening years undoubtedly were in the history of Britain, we have no record of them, and but one mention of the city, which refers merely to the refuge taken within London's protecting walls by the fugitives from Kent, after the famous battle of Crayford, in A.D. 457. With this event the Augusta of the Romans makes her last appearance. When we next hear of her she has become the London of the Anglo-Saxon period.

During all this time, however, events of tremendous magnitude were occurring throughout the land. The Angles and the Saxons were pouring over the country, and half-Romanized cities were yielding everywhere to the invaders, and, where they submitted peaceably, were being slowly and deliberately Anglo-Saxonized, while those that resisted were promptly reduced to terms by fire and massacre. What Britain suffered when Roman arms were making themselves felt in the

land can have been nothing compared to the suffering inflicted upon Roman Britain during the Anglo-Saxon conquest. The Roman conquest was that of civilization—pagan, to be sure, yet the best that the day afforded—over ignorance and barbarism; the Anglo-Saxon conquest that of barbarism and violence over a legal and orderly government. Nevertheless, it is to this very conquest that England owes its national character and present greatness. That such a conquest and transformation should have been so completely accomplished is in itself a marvel, but that the conquest of Essex and Middlesex, and especially of a great walled city, as London had then become, should have taken place without leaving the slightest historical record of the achievement is perhaps even more extraordinary. “No territory,” exclaims one of the greatest of historians, “ever passed so obscurely into the possession of an enemy as the north bank of the Thames.”

London, when she next appears to us, does so in the full-fledged capacity of the capital of a Saxon kingdom. The invaders of Roman Britain are divided by the chroniclers into Old Saxon, Angles and Jutes; but while we are told that from the Old Saxons came the men of Sussex and Wessex, yet of the actual conquerors of Essex and of London we hear nothing. Of their progress we have no record, and in A.D. 604 we find them in full and complete possession of the city. The Britons left in London must have indeed

The Crown Jewels, Tower of London

been few. With a single exception of Dow-Gate, the first syllable of which is probably Celtic, none of the local names survive. The great streets, whatever may have been their previous appellations, came to be known as the Watling Street and the Ermyrn Way. The market-places were called East Cheap and West Cheap, while the ports were known as Ludgate and Billingsgate. Nor did the streets of Saxon London follow in exact direction those of the Roman city. There seems to be little doubt that the northern road, later known as the Ermyrn Way, emerged from the Roman city at a point considerably east of the Saxon and mediæval Bishopsgate; nor did the west road, later known as the Watling Street, enter the city at the exact point at which New Gate was later constructed.

The history of London at this period is in reality the history of the fight between Christianity and the new paganism, for whatever had existed in the way of Christian worship during the Roman occupation had long since been obliterated by the then governing people, and England, which had been called upon for a century or more to worship under the priests of a new and a northern mythology, now turned once more to the Christian Church—that sole guide to all true civilization. How, it will be asked, did such a change come about? The reply is easy. In the midst of internecine strife and constant civil wars there ruled a king in Kent, Æthelberht by name, who for his

sagacity and wisdom deserves the same place among statesmen that his piety has given him among saints. Instead of seeking distinction in the widening of his overlordship, he sought the welfare of his people by his continued and ceaseless efforts to renew the intercourse, commercial and otherwise, which had previously existed between Britain and the continent of Europe. To further his plans, he determined upon an alliance by marriage with the Princess Bercta, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks. This union, which proved itself by its consequences one of the most potent in shaping the course of history, had far more important results than even Æthelberht could possibly have foreseen ; for, besides cementing the commercial relations of the two countries, it brought England and the English people once more within the circle of the Christian Church.

Bercta, like her Frankish kinsfolk, was a Christian, and a Christian bishop travelled in her train from Paris to Canterbury, which was then the royal city of the Kentish kingdom, where the ruined church of St. Martin was given them for their worship. Nor is this all ; for the illustrious pontiff who then occupied the Chair of Peter, and who has been justly designated Gregory the Great, saw in this marriage the hand of God held out in mercy to an unenlightened people. It was an opportunity, he felt, not to be sacrificed. Sending at once, therefore, for Augustin, a Roman abbot of that day, he instructed him to go to

England with a band of monks, and there to preach the gospel of the living God.

Many years before, Gregory, then a young deacon, had noticed, it is related, the white bodies and fair faces and golden hair of some youths, who stood bound in a Roman market-place to be sold as slaves. Asking from whence they came, "From Anglia" was the reply. "Not Angles, but angels," replied Gregory. "And from what country come they?" "From Deira," said the merchants. "De ira!" exclaimed Gregory; "aye, plucked from God's ire and called to Christ's mercy." And when to his question as to the name of their king they told him that it was *Ælla*, Gregory seized upon the word as a good omen, and cried out: "Alleluia shall be sung there!" And he kept his word. Augustin was, as we have seen, promptly dispatched to Kent, and, with his missionaries, landed at Ebbsfleet, on the very spot where Hengist, with his warriors, had landed more than a century before. *Æthelberht* received them sitting enthroned in the open air on the chalk down above Minster, from which, miles away, the eye catches glimpses of the towers of Canterbury, to which place the missionaries then proceeded.

Having entered the city in solemn procession, Canterbury, the first royal city of Saxon England, became also the centre of Christian influence. Latin became again one of the tongues of Britain—the language of its worship, and its literature and philosophic thought.

Nor were the influences of Christianity long in making themselves felt throughout the land, although it is much to be feared that the people of London did not take kindly to this change of gods, as the readoption of the Roman religion was not unassociated in their minds with the idea of Roman servitude. Christianity had, nevertheless, come to stay, and Bede, whose authority is certainly equal in trustworthiness to that of the early chroniclers, tells us that Æthelberht, being himself converted, not only ordered them to relinquish the worship of their own divinities, but established Melitus as Bishop of London, causing to be built for him the church of St. Paul, on the very spot where, it has been maintained, a temple dedicated to Diana in the early Roman, and a Christian place of worship in the latter Roman days, existed. The year of this momentous event is A.D. 610, and this is the first authentic mention of the church which was the precursor of the present St. Paul's Cathedral. The right of Æthelberht to interfere thus in the affairs of his neighbors—for London was, properly speaking, in the kingdom of Essex, the Thames being the natural boundary which divided that kingdom from the kingdom of Kent—has indeed been a matter of surprise, but it is perhaps explicable by the conversion of Seberht, king of Essex. To this king, indeed, is attributed the erection of the church or chapel of St. Peter in A.D. 616 on the low ground of the left bank of the Thames, then overgrown with thorns and surrounded

with water, and therefore called Thorny Isle, and on which spot Westminster Abbey now stands. It does not seem, however, that the London mission flourished; for, on the death of Seberht and the removal of Mellitus to the See of Canterbury, in which See he succeeded Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, the people of London, if not their rulers, seem to have relapsed into paganism.

It is difficult, indeed, to say who their rulers were at this time. It was a period of desperate struggles and fights. The possession of London seems to have been a matter not only of rivalry, but of uncertainty; for it does not appear that the men of Wessex succeeded in possessing themselves of the city, even after their victory over the East Saxons. In fact, when we next hear of London, some fifty years later, it is subject to Northumbria; for, while Sigeberht, king of Essex, who had been converted to Christianity, invited Cedd, brother of St. Chadd, to preach to the heathen of Essex, he had his quarters, several miles down the river, at Tilbury. Cedd was consecrated Bishop of London in 654 at Lindisfarne. When, after ten years, his episcopate closed, London was no longer in the power of Northumbria, but had passed into that of Mercia; and Bede tells us that Wina, a West Saxon bishop, being expelled from Winchester, took refuge in Mercia, and purchased from Wulfhere, king of that country, the bishopric of London. Shortly after this, we find that Sighere, king of Essex, and all his

followers, seceded from the church of Wina, and returned once more to their old form of worship; and though we have good reason to believe that, London being then under the rule of Mercia, the inhabitants of that city were not among the seceders, yet they must have, in a measure at least, been influenced by such an important proceeding.

It was under these conflicting and unfavorable circumstances, therefore, that London was Christianized. If Sighere was unfaithful to the cause, his cousin and colleague, Sebbi, was piously inclined, and his name is interesting to the student of London history, because of a charter relating to a grant of some land by a member of the then reigning family, a certain Æthelred, to Barking Abbey. This famous Benedictine Nunnery was situated at the east end of a road, now Great Tower Street, near the spot on which, during the Norman period, the Tower itself was erected; and dependent on the abbey was the church of All Hallows, one of the most ancient foundations in London, now known as All Hallows, Barking, in Tower Ward. The document above referred to is the earliest Saxon document of its kind, and is now preserved among the manuscripts of the British Museum. The distinctive title of "Barking" was added by the abbess of the Abbey of Barking, in Essex, to whom the vicarage of All Hallows belonged. Richard I. added a chapel, and Edward I. caused the statue of Our Lady of Barking to be erected. The chapel was

rebuilt by Richard III., and also a college, which was suppressed and pulled down in the second year of Edward VI.

The church had a narrow escape in the great fire, the dial and porch being burned. Its neighborhood to the Tower is, perhaps, the explanation of the interment therein of many of those who suffered execution on Tower Hill. Thus the headless body of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Bishop Fisher and Archbishop Laud were buried here, though since removed. There is a fine Flemish brass to Andrew Evyngar; but a more interesting one is that to William Thynne, clerk of the kitchen to Henry VIII. and editor of Chaucer's works. The cover of the font is of carved wood, by Grinling Gibbons. But the church is particularly interesting as that in which, on October 23, 1644, William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, was baptized, and from the fact that it was also the scene, on July 26, 1797, of the marriage of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, to Louisa Catherine Johnson.

Under Erkenwald, the fourth to wear the mitre of the See of London, the scandal connected with the simoniacal election of Wina was soon forgotten, and the church may be said to have finally taken root during his episcopate. He exerted his influence and energies not only in the spread of Christian doctrine, but in endeavors to regain for London the place which it once held as a city of importance. For this pur-

pose he caused the wall, which had fallen into a ruinous condition, to be repaired, and built the gate which has since borne the name of Bishopsgate. This gate is that which gave egress from the city to the Ermyrn Way, the great northern road; and while a gate had existed near this place in Roman days, the Saxon gate was placed considerably to the west of the Roman gate. There were, however, several other modes of egress to the city: that nearest the Thames, and which has been held to be the most ancient of the city gates—tradition ascribing its erection to the mythical Lud, in consequence of which it had been accorded the name of Ludgate—and three other gates, Newgate, Aldersgate, Cripplegate, and Moorgate, the latter a species of postern. That Ludgate is not the most ancient of the city gates is evident from the fact that it must have led only into a country lane skirting the Fleet, for the road between the city and Westminster lay in Saxon times, and up to a very much later period, through Holborn, and not along the river. It is probable, therefore, that Newgate held that honor, for it gave egress, even in Roman days, to the great road afterwards named the Watling Street, and which road was the principal way followed by travellers and merchants from the north and western country in entering the city, and by those who, seeking to cross the Thames by London Bridge, were compelled to cross the city in order to do so. The name of Newgate is, in all likelihood, explained

by the fact that, the old Roman gate having fallen into disrepair, a new gate was erected on the same site in Saxon times.

Aldersgate, so called because of its antiquity, it having been one of the first four gates of the city, was, next to Bishopsgate, the most important northerly exit from the city, and its erection greatly eased the traffic which had to crowd through Newgate, for the Watling Street bifurcated at the principal open place of the city—where met the Folkmote—and its most northerly division, passing by the church of St. Martin, later called St. Martins-le-Grand, sought egress by way of Aldersgate. Another northerly exit was Cripplegate, not far distant, and which was situated at the end of Wood Street. This gate, originally a postern, led to the Barbican, then a fortified watch tower, in advance of the city walls. It owed its name, not, as has been supposed, from the fact that cripples gathered there to seek alms, but from the Anglo-Saxon word “crepel” or “crypele,” meaning a den or passage underground; for the road between the postern and the burghkenning ran between two low walls, most likely of earth, which formed what in fortification would be described as a covered way. About one thousand feet to the east of Cripplegate was another postern, which came, in Plantagenet times, when a gate was erected there, to be known as Moorgate, from the fact that it led to the Moorfields, without the walls, to the north of the city. Aldgate,

a gate in the city wall toward the east, and between Bishopsgate and the Thames, was—though according to many authorities called Aldgate from its antiquity—in reality of later origin, there being no evidence of its existence in Saxon times. Four other gates, Bridgegate, which gave egress to travellers going south over London Bridge, Dowgate, Ebbgate and Billingsgate, pierced the city walls on the river side.

All these gates, save perhaps the three last mentioned, came in time to be monumental structures, though their beauty and symmetry must have been greatly impaired from the fact that over each gate were chambers and buildings used either as public prisons or private dwellings. Thus Newgate is mentioned as early as 1188 as a prison for felons and debtors, while the lodgings over Aldgate in 1374 were leased to Geoffrey Chaucer for the term of his natural life. Newgate, which had fallen into disrepair, was rebuilt under Henry I., but does not seem to have been enlarged, and so noisome and crowded were its upper tenements that during the epidemic of plague, in 1414, the gatekeeper and sixty-four of the prisoners died of the scourge. Finally it was decided to rebuild it, and to remove the prison to an adjoining structure. This was effected through the efforts and largely through the munificence of Richard Whytynghton, though the Newgate was still unfinished when he died in 1425. The Newgate, which

was quite a monumental affair, was adorned on the outer or western side by four statues—Liberty, who, in honor of the departed Whytyngton, was depicted as having his famous cat lying at her feet; Peace, Plenty and Concord; while, in the inner or eastern side, it was ornamented by three statues—Justice, Mercy and Truth. The structure was destroyed by the great fire in 1666, but rebuilt in 1672.

From the fact, presumably, that Bishopsgate was built under the auspices and largely from funds provided by Erkenwald, it was held that the repair of the gate devolved naturally upon his successors in the See of London. This burden, however, was one of which they soon rid themselves, and the real burden and expense fell upon the shoulders of the Hanse merchants, who caused it to be finally reconstructed in 1417. It was taken down in 1731, and a larger but less ornamental structure erected in its stead the following year. Ludgate, of which the true derivation seems to have been from "*Lode*"—a sewer emptying into a bigger stream, probably the Fleet, which emptied into the Thames, does not seem to have been quite so elaborate an affair, though, when it was rebuilt at the time of Queen Elizabeth, statues of the mythical Lud and his two sons were placed on its eastern side, while its western side was adorned by a statue of Queen Elizabeth herself. When the gate was finally taken down, these were sold by the city to Sir Francis Gosling, who destined them for the east

end of the church of St. Dunstan in the West. This absurdity, however, was not achieved, and the statues of Lud and his progeny eventually found their way to the ash-heap, though that of Queen Elizabeth fared a better fate, and a special niche was made for it on the outside of St. Dunstan's Church.

Aldersgate was several times rebuilt, finally in 1617 from a design by Gerard Christmas. Through it, James I., who had waited for well nigh a year the abatement of the plague at the Charterhouse, outside the walls, entered the city when he came to take possession of his new dominion. It suffered greatly during the great fire, but was rebuilt, and here the heads of several of the regicides were exposed for public derision and abhorrence.

Of Cripplegate and Moorgate there is little to be said. The latter—though not mentioned in the list of gates until 1356, seems to have existed in Saxon times, and to have been an enlarged postern near the place where the waters of the Walbrook left the city—was rebuilt in 1472, and is subsequently described as one of the “most magnificent” gates of the city. The old Aldgate—through which the first Queen Mary entered the city on ascending the throne, and where her sister Elizabeth greeted her, accompanied by two thousand horse, and where the two exchanged perfidious embraces—was taken down in 1606, and a fine new one erected in its stead. The new gate was on the outer side adorned by a statue of James I.,

standing on the royal supporters, while two Roman soldiers were represented, one on either side of the gate, as being armed and ready to defend its entrance, and on the inner side by statues of Fortune, Peace and Charity. The system of leasing the tenements above the gates for private dwellings, even though it was stipulated that the lessees should keep them in repair under penalty of ejectment from the premises, and that the mayor and city authorities reserved to themselves the right to enter the premises in the time of war, disturbance and public defence, resulted, nevertheless, in great evils, and the nuisance was finally stopped by an act of the city in 1386, decreeing that "no grant shall from henceforth in any way be made unto any person of the gates or of the dwelling houses above the gates," etc. The newer gates, erected in place of the older ones, became therefore merely monumentally defensive structures, and finally an Act of Parliament, passed in 1760, empowered the city authorities to remove the gates and effect other improvements; and under its provisions these relics of past methods of fortification were torn down, and their materials sold and carted away. It is, perhaps, a sad commentary on past greatness that the materials of Aldersgate, esteemed one of the finest of the city gates, brought only £91, and that many of the statues which adorned them fared the fate of Lud and his two sons.

Not only did secular improvement gain a new start

under the very wide influence of Erkenwald, but, as was only natural, Christian churches now began to rear themselves openly on the ruins or sites of pagan temples. Already, as we have seen, in the year 610 tradition has it that Æthelberht caused a new St. Paul's to be erected on the spot where a Christian temple had existed in the later Roman days; and Seberht in 614, by his high patronage, and doubtless also by his financial assistance, was largely instrumental in the erection of a church edifice which came to be known by the name of St. Peter's, and which was situated outside the city, near the place where the old ford of the Thames existed, and on the spot where Westminster Abbey now stands. Under the episcopal administration of Erkenwald, the erection of Christian churches continued steadily, and by the close of the seventh century London was already adequately supplied with Christian temples.

Close to St. Paul's, as though seeking protection from another church, two others nestled—that is, St. Gregory-under-St.-Paul's and St. Faith-under-St.-Paul's. The first of these two was actually attached to the south wall of St. Paul's itself. It was the parish church of the neighborhood, but when destroyed in the great fire was not rebuilt, the parish work being removed to St. Mary Magdalen's, Knight-rider Street. It was of St. Gregory that the learned Dr. John Hewitt (executed for treason on Tower Hill in 1658, because he had been sending money to the

king) was rector; and here also that Jeremy Taylor delivered some of his most famous sermons, and that Evelyn heard him in 1654. The church of St. Faith, while not actually murally joined to St. Paul's, yet was near enough to the larger edifice to be in very close proximity of the latter's northeasterly corner. In fact, when the cathedral was enlarged in that direction, which was done in 1255, it was found necessary to remove it to make way for the extension. It was then that a chapel of St. Faith was arranged in the crypt of the larger church, though this again was changed under Henry VIII., when a chapel in the body of the church proper, to which was given the name of Jesus Chapel, was substituted for the chapel in the crypt. Attached to the old St. Faith of Saxon origin had, in fact, been a Jesus chapel, which had a bell-tower containing four great bells. They existed until the reign of the above-mentioned monarch, when Sir Miles Partridge won them from the king over a game of dice, and had them taken down and sold for old copper.

Next to St. Paul's, the most important church of Saxon times was probably St. Peter's-upon-Cornhill, at the corner of what is now Gracechurch Street, that southerly extremity of Bishopsgate Within, but which was in Saxon times called the Ermyn Way. Concerning this church, we have already seen that the legend of its foundation by the apocryphal Lucius, "King of the Britons," rests upon no reliable or even

credible evidence. At the time when the said Lucius is supposed to have "reigned" over the Britons, London and the greater portion of Britain was in the possession and under the control of the Roman power—a power then pagan and not Christianized—and Lucius, if he lived at all, was at most a tributary chief of a small band of Britons, in refuge in the mountain fastnesses of Wales, or the North Country. It could have been only long after—at least a century and a half later—that, owing to the conversion of Constantine, London, then Augusta, became a Christian city, and that Christian churches were openly erected. That St. Peter's-upon-Cornhill was erected about this time, and was thus a place of Christian worship in the later Roman days, is possible, though there is no evidence to prove it; and it is far more likely that, like St. Æthelburgha and St. Osyth, it owes its foundation to the great spirit of Erkenwald, that zealous successor of St. Augustin of Canterbury. Even though it had existed in later Roman days, it must have been destroyed during the tumultuous confusion of the Saxon invasion and conquest, or fallen into ruin during the two centuries of the new paganism which swept over the land on the coming of the northern barbarians, and owed its reconstruction and re-establishment to the new life which, under his episcopal administration, animated Christian London. The old church suffered annihilation by the great fire, and the present edifice was erected under that great

master architect to whom London owes so many of its monuments, Sir Christopher Wren.

Another important church of the Saxon period seems to have been the church of St. Martin-le-Grand. This ancient collegiate church and sanctuary stood on the site of the present General Post Office, in the open space which was formed by the bifurcation of the Watling Street, at which juncture, adjoining the open space where the Folkmote met, it divided in the direction of Newgate and Aldersgate. St. Martin-le-Grand was, in fact, one of the oldest collegiate institutions of the realm, and was connected by tradition with Seberht, Bercta and Mellitus. Another tradition attributed its foundation to Wihtred, king of Kent in the eighth century. Like many others, it suffered greatly during the great Danish wars, and was completely rebuilt in the days of Edward the Confessor. The church was greatly enlarged and embellished through the munificence of Ingelric, Earl of Essex, and his brother Girard, in 1056, and confirmed by a charter of William the Conqueror in 1068, which charter exempted it from all civil and even ecclesiastical jurisdiction, so that, while within the walls of the city of London, it became a liberty by itself. The mayor and the corporation often endeavored, in later years, but always in vain, to interfere with the privileges of the precinct. It became naturally the refuge of every malefactor who sought protection from justice, and criminals, on their way from the prison over

Newgate to their execution at Tower Hill, passed the southern gate of St. Martin's, and often sought, and sometimes successfully, to escape from their gaolers into the adjoining sanctuary. As late as the reign of Henry VI., a soldier, on his way from Newgate to the Guildhall, was seized by five of his comrades, who came suddenly out of the Panyer Alley, in Newgate Street, and forced him from the officer of the compter into the adjacent sanctuary of St. Martin's. Again, later still, if we may credit Sir Thomas More, one of the murderers of the young "Princes of the Tower" here rotted away, starving and forgotten, yet safe from the officers of the law while he remained within its protecting shelter. It was from the tower of St. Martin's that tolled the bell of the curfew hour, when all the gates of the city were to be shut, "not to be opened afterwards that night, unless by special precept" of the city authorities, whether bishop, portreeve, or, in later years, the mayor and aldermen; and also shut as well were to be "all the taverns for wine or for ale," and no one was to "go about the streets or ways." The ringing of the curfew at St. Martin's was the signal for the ringing of the bells of every parish church, so that they began and ended together. At the first stroke of the curfew at St. Martin's the great gates were closed and the wickets opened, and at the last stroke the wickets were themselves closed. Any person found wandering about the streets after curfew had rung, "with sword and buckler, or with

Post Office

any other arm, doing mischief whereof evil suspicion may arise, or in any other manner, unless it be some great lord or other substantial person of good reputation, or a person of their household who from them shall have a warranty, and who is going from one to another with a light to guide him," was promptly taken into custody, and put into the Tun Prison in Cornhill, "which for such misdoers is assigned."

In the repetition of the ordinance in the 37th of Edward III. (1363) the bell "at the church of our Lady at Bow" was substituted for that of St. Martin's, and Newgate Prison for that of the Tun in Cornhill. At the dissolution of the religious houses in 1537, the college was levelled to the ground, and the church itself, destroyed in the great fire of 1666, was not rebuilt. The precincts themselves, however, retained the privilege of sanctuary until the Act 21, James I., c. 28 (1623), declared that all such privilege of sanctuary should thereafter be void. Notwithstanding this, the place still afforded shelter to debtors until 1697, when, by the Act 8 and 9, William III., "all such sanctuaries or pretended sanctuaries" were finally suppressed. When the excavations were being made in 1818 for the foundations of the General Post Office, an early crypt, and vaults of a still earlier foundation, were laid bare; but the new masonry soon again concealed the old structure, and thus was the last vestige of St. Martin-le-Grand finally destroyed.

While not perhaps so important in point of interest

as either of the two just described, the church of St. Andrew was nevertheless of considerable importance, even as early as the Saxon period. It stood on the site which is now the northeasterly corner of Leadenhall Street and St. Mary Axe, and came eventually to be specially designated as St. Andrew's Undershaft, because, "of old time every year on May Day it was used that an high or long shaft or Maypole was set up there before the south door of said church." Thus was the church designated, to distinguish it from others in the city dedicated to the same saint. The last year that the shaft overlooking the old church was erected was on "Evil Mayday," 1517, when a serious fray occurred between the apprentices and the foreigners settled in the parish, which so greatly marred the festivities of the occasion that it was held sufficient reason for suppressing the custom. The old church having become unsuited for the needs of later days, a new structure was erected on the same site in 1520-1532—one of the latest of the perpendicular period of Gothic architecture, and one of the first in London adapted to the form of the new worship.

Among the other churches of the Saxon period, St. Æthelburgha and St. Osyth stand out the most conspicuously. Both were named, if we may accept tradition of the times, after the daughters of kings—princesses who had earnestly engaged in the conversion of the benighted Saxons. Æthelburgha was the daughter of no less a person than Æthelberht of

Kent, whose wife Bercta, of France, had brought back Christianity to the shores of Britain. She was also a niece of Ricula, wife of Seberht of Essex, the first Christian king of that country. Having witnessed the terrible consequences brought about by the weakness of Mellitus, the scandalous behavior of Wina and the perversity of her cousins, the sons of Seberht, she lived to see the faith of her heart once more established, and earned her saintship as well by her zealous efforts in its behalf as by the perfection of her life. The church which bears her name escaped the great fire, and is undoubtedly one of the oldest now remaining in London. It was built near the gate of Bishop Erkenwald, and is now reached by an alley from Bishopsgate Street Within.

The other—that is, the church of St. Osyth—was situated to the south of the market-place known as West Cheap, on the west bank of the Walbrook. St. Osyth, it would appear, was the mother of Offa, a royal youth of great beauty and loveliness, if we may believe Bede, who deserted wife, lands, kindred and country, to go to Rome with Coinred, king of Mercia, where both took monastic vows. That he actually reigned as king is a fact not mentioned by Bede; nor is this to be wondered at, since we find him not unfrequently referred to as king of Mercia, whereas Essex was in reality his kingdom. Dying childless, he was succeeded by his cousin Selred, who was killed in 746. The church of St. Osyth, having fallen into

disrepair, was restored by Benedict Shorne, a wealthy fishmonger of the reign of Edward II., and became known by his name, the street only retaining its original appellation. By one of the singular corruptions so common in England, St. Benedict Shorne became St. Bennet Sherehog, by which name the church was known until it was destroyed by the great fire, never to be rebuilt.

To the same period belongs also another great name, that of St. Botolph, who is commemorated in four churches. St. Botolph was the particular patron saint of East Anglia, and to his special protection all wayfarers going north over the bridge commended themselves. The most ancient of the churches erected in his honor stood at the foot of the hill leading to the bridge, while another was immediately without Bishopsgate, on the very first step, as it were, of the Ermyrn Way. Later, when Aldersgate was, as we have seen, opened to relieve the traffic through what until then had been the only northern outlet of the city, another St. Botolph was erected, in order that the traveller selecting the new road should not be deprived of the blessings attendant on a visit to the shrine of the wayfarers' patron saint; and again, when Aldgate was opened in the eleventh century, a fourth St. Botolph's Church was erected, for the same reason, near this new outlet of the city. Of these four churches, the first and oldest, which stood on the west at the foot of the hill in approaching London Bridge, and

was known as St. Botolph's Billingsgate, and which possessed perhaps the greatest historic interest, was destroyed in the great fire and never rebuilt; the second, "without Bishopsgate," also destroyed in the great fire, was rebuilt in the first half of the last century, the first stone being laid in 1725 and the work completed in 1728 under the direction of Giles Dance, the father of George Dance, the architect; the third, "without Aldersgate," while not wholly destroyed in the great fire, suffered considerably, and had to be taken down eventually, the present edifice having been erected in 1754-'57; while the fourth mentioned—that is, St. Botolph "without Aldgate"—while it escaped the great fire, became so dilapidated that it had to be taken down, the present structure having been erected in 1741-'44 under the younger Dance.

Of these other churches of which the establishment date of Saxon times, the most noteworthy are St. Michael's upon Cornhill, situated, as its name indicated, upon Cornhill, and which stood in an open space a little to the west of St. Peter's Church, already mentioned; St. Dunstan, which came to be called St. Dunstan in the East (to distinguish it from a later St. Dunstan subsequently erected in the West, in Fleet Street), and which stood on the slope of St. Dunstan's Hill, between Tower Street and Lower Thames Street, now the corner of St. Dunstan's Hill and St. Idol's Lane; St. Magnus the Martyr, which

stood on the east at the foot of the hill in approaching London Bridge, opposite the old Saxon church of St. Botolph; St. Stephen, which stood on the left bank of the Walbrook, a little to the southeast of the poultry market, in what is now Walbrook Street, back of the Mansion House; St. Swithin, which was situated on the northern side of the way, at the conjunction of the Watling Street and of the old road which was parallel to the river, and which followed the line now identified with the lower portion of Queen Victoria Street and the present Canon Street; St. Mary (Aldermary), which stood a little to the south of the Watling Street, between St. Faith's and St. Swithin, now within the triangle formed by what remains of the Watling Street, Bow Lane and Queen Victoria Street; St. Mary Magdalen, on the north side of the already mentioned river road, now the corner of Knightrider Street and the Old Change; and St. Mary Somerset, on the south side of the said road, now on the north side of Upper Thames Street. All these suffered annihilation during the great fire, but were reconstructed on the same sites under the direction and from the plans of Sir Christopher Wren. There were also the churches of St. Peter at the Cross, which stood on the site which is now the northwest corner of Cheapside and Wood Street, St. Mary Bothaw, which was situated on the south side of the way, at the conjunction of the Watling Street and the river road, diagonally opposite St. Swithin's,

another and third St. Peter's, and Holy Trinity the Less, both of which were situated in the meadows between the river road and the river, and near to St. Mary Somerset. All of these suffered destruction also in the great fire and were not rebuilt.

The kings of Mercia having once possessed themselves of London, did not easily relinquish their precious acquisition, and in a charter of Æthelbald of Mercia, whose reign extended from 718 to 757, and which said charter bears the date A.D. 734, there is special mention made of London in connection with privileges concerning port and shipping, this being, indeed, the first mention of London in any contemporary document now extant. Said charter is preserved in the British Museum, and states that the king, while the collecting of all the port taxes is one of his royal prerogatives, grants to the Bishop of Rochester the right of free entry to the port for one ship, either his property or that of another. Offa of Mercia, one of Æthelbald's immediate successors, makes no mention of London in any of his charters, but Coenulf, his successor, speaks of a Witan, or National Council, held in London in 811, and, in alluding to London, he calls it "the illustrious place and royal city."

The importance of London, considered strategically or commercially, being now duly appreciated and recognized by the rival sovereigns of the so-called Heptarchy, its possession seems to have been one of the principal aims and ambitions of their respective

existences. When the supremacy of Mercia declined and that of Wessex arose, London became the property of the conqueror. Egberht received in 823 the submission of Essex. In 827 we learn that he was present in London, and in 833 he held a Witan there, at which he presided in state. This Witan was held to consider a matter of the highest importance. The hour of retribution had arrived. What the Saxons' forefathers had inflicted on the Britons was in turn to be inflicted by the Danes on them; but the Saxons were made of sterner stuff than the Britons, and realizing the verity of the maxim which ascribes to unity of thought and purpose the greater strength, they buried their petty jealousies, and, making England into a single kingdom as it were, thereby temporarily, at least, overcame their enemies. London was of course the principal point of attack. Its walls unfortunately wholly failed in their protection, and the Danes, after a successful siege, broke into the city. When repulsed, they broke in again, and so much did they come to consider it their property and headquarters, that when in 872 Alfred the Great was compelled to make a truce with them, they actually retired to London, as if it were legitimately their own city.

With his military experience and political sagacity Alfred saw clearly that London was an absolute necessity. For the king of England to be deprived of his rightful capital, and thus reduced to be a

wanderer in his dominions, was for him to be indeed in a pitiable plight. It was long, however, before he accomplished his end. His plans were matured in 884. The story of the conflict is to all intents and purposes the story of his life. To capture London was his easiest task; to keep it a task of far greater difficulty. Finding what remained of the Roman defences practically useless, and the repairs made by the Saxons and the Danes equally ineffectual, and appreciating the value of fortifications against barbarians, his first object, after establishing his power, was the restoration of the ancient walls. To him may be attributed the building of at least two, if not three, of the newer gates which we have already had occasion to mention—that is, Aldersgate, Cripplegate and Moorgate.

Whatever may have been the extent of Alfred's work of reparation, we have but few details on the subject. Suffice it, however, that it proved all that was necessary; for London, now fortified, held out against the Danes, when all of Middlesex, Essex, Kent, Sussex and even Hampshire were in possession of the enemy. Meanwhile London had also increased greatly in wealth. From the holding of a Witan there in 833 by Egberht, London had become the royal city, and a palace, of which the first buildings were erected during Egberht's reign and by his orders, and which was greatly enlarged and beautified by Æthelstan, became the usual habitation of the English

kings. Indeed, so great were the alterations and additions made to Egberht's palace by Æthelstan that the palace has come to be generally referred to as the palace of Æthelstan. The greater security which London afforded naturally attracted merchants and other men of business, and London's greater commercial importance is proved by the fact that when this last mentioned king in 931 established his mints, he assigned eight coiners to London and only seven to Canterbury, which had previously out-rivalled London in commercial activity. Already in Æthelstan's reign we find a "Frithguild" in existence. Though in reality nothing more than a friendly association, organized for purposes of social reunion, yet its importance will be appreciated when later we see how great was the influence of the guilds upon the development of the city.

Under Egberht, surnamed the Peaceable, not only commerce, but also the ecclesiastical establishments, gained greatly, and the church of St. Peter at Westminster, which had, as we have seen, owed its foundation to Seberht, was, with its adjacent monastery, notably enlarged. His reign is, however, on the other hand, associated with one of those great calamities which at irregular intervals visited London as a terrible scourge, and so materially affected its development and prosperity; for in the year 961 occurred one of the great London fires, in which the cathedral church of St. Paul, which owed its erection to that

great saint, Æthelberht, king of Kent, suffered destruction.

Æthelred found within the walls of London the protection which his misfortunes and political necessities demanded. Here he felt, at least, in partial security from the Danes, and it was during this reign, and from London, that started the famous expedition of 992, whereby the river was again opened to commerce, and on the return of which expedition an attack from the Danes was so successfully repulsed. This security was not, however, to be long lived. Sweyn burned with a desire to possess himself of the city. He felt that without London he could never make good his title to being king of England. The capital city was the keystone of the throne. Twice he essayed to subdue the city by a siege; and while, on the first occasion, Æthelred, feeling the weakness of his arms and the powerlessness of his position, endeavored to buy him off, and succeeded in so doing, the second time, Sweyn, having taken Canterbury, was emboldened thereby and refused to withdraw. Æthelred, fearing that the end had come to all resistance, fled, and the citizens, feeling themselves without a leader, threw open the gates and admitted the Danes. But Sweyn did not long survive his triumph; for, the climate of London evidently not agreeing with him, he died, after only one winter spent in his capital, at Gainsborough, in 1013. This was, of course, the signal for the return of Æthelred, who,

re-entering his capital, ended his days within its protecting walls two years later, in April, 1016. He was buried, we are told, in the then existing church of St. Paul. If so, his grave must have been among the ruins of the old St. Paul, the church of Cedd and Sebbi, if not of Mellitus and Seberht; for it had, as we have seen, been destroyed by fire some years before—that is, in 951—and it is scarcely probable or possible that the new church was as yet completed.

On the death of Æthelred, the Witan which called his son Edmund, surnamed “Ironside,” to the throne, was held in London. His coronation followed, and with his installation the contest between the Saxon and Danish royal families commenced again. Canute, Sweyn’s son, disputed Edmund’s title to the crown. In the troubles that followed, Edmund’s bravery is beyond dispute; but his caution may, indeed, be questioned, for by leaving the protection of London’s walls—in the protection of which such reliance had been placed by Alfred the Great and the late king Æthelred, his own father—he jeopardized and finally lost his cause. Canute triumphed, and Edmund was foully murdered at Oxford, on November 30, 1016, in the autumn of the year in which he had succeeded to the throne.

The events of the Danish occupation, and those that followed it to the time of the Norman conquest, belong properly to the history of England, and, while they had undoubtedly some bearing on the growth

and development of London, they can scarcely be considered as sufficiently considerable or important to deserve any lengthy recapitulation in the treatment of this present theme. There are, however, numerous traces of the Danish occupation in London, some of which call for our attention. As Thor and Odin had been brought over by the Saxon invaders, so does the name of Olave follow in the wake of the Danish conquest. We find this name disguised in modern times under the name of Tooley Street, situated at the southern extremity of London Bridge; and several churches were also dedicated to the saint, one of which still stands at the southwestern corner of Hart Street and Seething Lane, at the top of Crutched Friars. The old church was at some period replaced by the present structure, though at what exact time does not seem to appear. The present edifice survived the great fire, and has become better known, less for its connection with the Danish period than for its connection with Samuel Pepys, who worshipped there, and by whom it is mentioned frequently in his diary. It has been frequently restored. There were two other St. Olaves—one called St. Olave (Jewry), the other St. Olave (Silver Street).

Another church, the foundation of which is of the post Danish-Saxon period, is that of St. Edmund the King, which stood on one of the lanes leading from the poultry market to the Ermyrn Way, which lane now bears the name of Lombard Street. The church

was dedicated to a certain Edmund, known to martyrology as "King of the East Angles" — and who is said to have been killed by the Danes in the year 870. As to the origin of St. Clement Danes, it is perhaps more difficult to decide the exact time of its foundation. It may or may not be of the era of Canute. The objection advanced to its having been founded at that time is that in those days its situation was quite unprotected, being beyond the walls, and it has been held to be unlikely that a Danish settlement would have been so placed, between London and Westminster; while it is held by others that this objection is not acceptable, since access to the settlement could and must have been from the north, the road between London and Westminster running through Holborn. As regards St. Bride's, it is esteemed certain that it cannot be of the time of Canute, since the ground on which it stands was then under water. Both St. Clement Danes and St. Bride's, and also St. Dunstan's in the West, were at first, however, only chapels of ease or district churches of Westminster.

It would seem to have been under the reign of Canute that London obtained its first corporative existence; for at his death, the chronicle tells us that the magnates of the realm assembled in solemn parliament, and among the representatives enumerated are the "lithsmen" of London. These were the traders or merchants of the city, who were not only the own-

ers, but who during Canute's long reign became the actual administrators of the city's wealth. The Witan which followed the death of Canute chose his eldest born, Harold, as his successor; and three years later, on his death, another Witan summoned Emma, widow of both Æthelred and Canute, and her son, Hardecnute, from Bruges, and accorded the crown to the latter. This estimable prince distinguished himself principally by causing the body of his half-brother and predecessor to be dug up and cast into the Thames. It is related that it was found, however, by some fishermen, and given decent burial in St. Clement Danes, which is held to account for the name of that church. At the death of Hardecnute, Edward, surnamed the Confessor, and who was the son of Æthelred and Emma, and therefore the half-brother of Hardecnute, was called to the throne. His history is connected more with Westminster than with London, and it is to him that Westminster, previously known as St. Peter's in the West, owes its transformation from merely a monastic church into a full-fledged abbey and royal residence.

In order that we may have a correct appreciation of what Westminster was in the days of him of whom we write, it will be necessary to return to its very beginnings, when it was nought but a sort of mud flat, surrounded on every side by perfectly open country. As late as the sixth century, the greater part of what is now Westminster was a sort of tidal estuary, which

twice a day was covered by the brackish waters of the Thames. Here, in the midst of a marsh, arose a species of hillock, the "Tothill," of which memory is preserved to us in Tothill Street; and upon the slight eminence, as we have seen in a previous chapter, the ancient Roman road, which diverged at the foot of the Edgware Road, ran to the water's edge, where the Thames was forded.

Here, probably as far back as the Roman days, stood a building, a sort of post-house, at which the weary wayfarer could be temporarily accommodated. It was to take the place of the inn, if such it may be called, that the first house of monks of the Order of St. Benedict was founded. In connection with this religious house, it is related, as we have seen, that a church was built, by the generosity of Seberht, king of Essex, in 610, which church he dedicated to St. Peter. While this date is assigned by some, however, as that of the foundation of the monastery, other authorities hold it more probable that the real foundation occurred in 730-740. Offa, king of Mercia, in referring to the church and monastery in a grant of London, bearing the date of 785, speaks of it, in the first instance, merely as St. Peter's. A second time he refers to it, however, as "Thorney," *locus terribilis* (terrible place), which appellation it has been claimed had reference to the thorns which abounded in that locality, though it is more likely that it came by that name because the traveller who waited to cross the

Westminster Abbey

Thames here had to wade as best he could to the first stepping-stone, so to speak, in the shallow stream being the Thorney. Offa refers to the place a third time as Westminster, which name it acquired evidently because of the position it occupied in reference to the city.

By the time of Edward the Confessor the place had, however, assumed quite a different appearance. The abbey, which had stood quite close to the water's edge, had come to be gradually separated therefrom by a belt of land, foreshore at first, but later entirely reclaimed, and which is at present the site of the Houses of Parliament. The plans of the king for the enlargement and beautifying of the church and its adjacent buildings were extensive, and the new abbey church was only completed in time to permit of its consecration on Innocents' Day, December 28, 1065—that is, just a week before the king died. The church was built in the Norman style, as though anticipatory of the future conquerors of the country, and was held to be a structure of great grandeur and beauty, and its size, occupying as it did almost the whole area of the present building, was for those days in itself a thing unusual. Built of stone, the exterior was richly sculptured, and the windows were filled with stained glass. The roof was covered with lead, and in the centre a tower arose, which was crowned, as it were, by a cupola of wood. While the east end was rounded by an apse, the western end was adorned by two smaller towers, which contained a chime of five bells.

Of this edifice nothing, however, remains but some fragments of substructure, as the church was almost entirely rebuilt by Henry III., and continually altered in subsequent reigns. The cloisters, chapterhouse, refectory, dormitory and infirmary, which had been commenced under Edward the Confessor, if not completed under him, were all brought to completion in the next generation according to the original plan.

During his reign the beginnings of later municipal institutions had their inception. • Edward directs one of his writs to William, the bishop, and Swetman, the portreeve, and another to Leofstan and Ælsi, portreeves; and again, a little later, we find Esgar, the staller, and Ulph the chief officers of the city. The chief mart of the city was the open, oblong space to the east of the large central square where the Folk-mote met, and which was just before St. Paul's. This long, open space contained the booths of the vendors of all the commodities which were required for existence by the customs and civilization of the time. From this it derived its name, "Cyp-pan," the Anglo-Saxon "to buy—to bargain," which was entirely expressive of the nature of the place. This was the present Cheapside. It came eventually to be distinguished as West Cheap, because of the more easterly mart nearer the Tower, which was denominated East Cheap. The neighboring farmers brought the produce of the fields into the city in huge carts, from which the contents were sold to the various vendors,

who dispensed them again for a consideration from behind their stalls. Sometimes, though, the carts themselves were drawn up in proper order, and the contents were disposed of by the occupants, who not infrequently consisted of the farmer's whole family, who, having accompanied him to the city, thus spent the day. The booths of the vendors of different wares were assigned specific places; thus the Wax Chandlers stood on the south side of the Watling Street, the nearest to Newgate and before the Folk-mote place was reached in entering the city from that point, while the Tallow Chandlers were situated to the southeast of St. Paul's, on the opposite side of the place.

In Cheapside proper, on the north side, the booths were arranged in the following order: The Goldsmiths came first. The place assigned to them was at the corner of St. Martin-le-Grand and the Cheap. Next to them came the Turners of Wood, who sold the wooden bowls, cups and spoons which formed the sole utensils of the table or the kitchen in those primitive days. Their place of business extended as far as the present Wood Street, on the other side of which were the Wood Merchants, properly speaking—that is, those who sold wood for fuel. They spread themselves out as far as the present Milk Street, on the other side of which came the Milk Dealers and the Sellers of Honey. Next to them, and on the other side of what is now Ironmongers Lane, came the Ironmongers themselves, who had as their immediate

neighbors the Fruiterers, who extended their trade as far as the Old Jewry, beyond which came the dealers whose occupation is so apt to be brought to mind by the last-mentioned name—that is, the Clothiers, whether of new or of second-hand garments. Beyond these again came the Poultry Market, from which the present Poultry takes its name. On the south side of the Cheap, going from west to east, came first the Bakers, from whom Bread Street takes its name, and beyond them the Mercers, and finally Grocers, the Pepperers and the Spicers. Later on, when the vendors of the various commodities had organized themselves into guilds and companies, and obtained royal charters in their corporate name, each erected a hall of meeting, and to-day some of the halls of the present city companies are on the site originally assigned to their wares in Saxon times, though in the cases of the Mercers and the Grocers, they have crossed the Cheap to the north side. Here in the Cheap the busiest side of the city's life was to be seen. Here the housewives came to purchase their daily stock of provisions for the family supper; here the men met to discuss the topics of the hour and the latest news from afar; here the Anglo-Saxon, the Dane, the remaining Briton and the Roman merchant passed each other, stopped to talk for a few moments and transacted their businesses; and here, all or at least the greater part of what we now term the life of the street was to be found.

CHAPTER IV.

NORMAN LONDON.

The Conquest—William of Normandy enters London—His Charter—The Building of the Tower—Its History and Associations—The Chapel of St. John—The Domesday Book—Establishment of the First Jewry—Foundation of the Abbey of Bermondsey—William II.—Erection of the Palace of Westminster—Law Courts at Westminster Hall—St. Stephen's Chapel—Henry I.—His Charter concerning Middlesex—Foundation of the Priory of Holy Trinity at Aldgate—Foundation of the Priory of St. Mary Overies—Foundation of the Priory of St. Bartholomew the Great—Convent of St. Mary at Clerkenwell—Convent of St. John the Baptist at Halliwell—Foundation of the Hospital of St. Giles in the Field—The Rise of the Orders of Chivalry—The Knights of St. John at Clerkenwell—The Knights Templar at Holborn—Stephen of Blois—Destruction of London Bridge—The Church of St. Mary (Aldermanbury)—Great St. Helen's—The Hospital of St. Alphage—The Hospital of St. Katherine by the Tower—Foundation of Modern Society—Birth of Romantic Literature.

IF the Saxons, when they entered upon their conquests, came into a country demoralized by other incursions than their own, such was not the good fortune of William the Conqueror and his Norman followers. It is true that Edward, the last of the Saxon kings, had just died, and that the rightful heir and

claimant of the throne, Edgar Ætheling, grandson of Edmund Ironside, had been passed over, and Harold, son of Earl Godwin, elected by the Witan to fill his place. Yet both Harold and his father had so long occupied positions of influence and importance at the late king's court, that the transition of Harold from the steps of the throne to actual occupancy of the chair of state was scarcely perceptible, and Edgar Ætheling had been so generally admitted to be unfit for the royal duties, that, in those days the principle of legitimacy having not yet taken firm root in the nation, and the elective principle being viewed as quite natural, all seemed to augur a long and peaceful rule for the new dynasty, had it not been for the ambition of the Duke of Normandy, and his power to put his plans into execution.

To detail the circumstances which led to his invasion, to describe that great event—the battle of Senlac—and to narrate the occurrences which followed, would be to usurp the duties of the dynastic historian, duties not legitimately ours, if the scope of this work be considered. We must therefore pass over these thrilling and imposing pictures to that time when William was, by a series of circumstances, brought into immediate contact with London itself.

William returned to Hastings from Senlac. He had fondly thought that with that battle the campaign was over, but such he soon found was not the

case. The death of Harold had been followed by unexpected complications. On the news of his death reaching London, a Witan had immediately been held, and Edgar Ætheling had, notwithstanding his supposed disability, been unanimously elected to the kingly office, and London put in a state of defence by the citizens. Unfortunately for his adherents, Edgar was young, and not particularly brilliant in his attainments or keen in his military judgment. The first place in his council devolved, therefore, on Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the military operations were committed to the two most powerful Earls, Edwin and Morcar. William, in the meanwhile, having marched against London, their first efforts were unsuccessful ; a large body of troops sent out of the city in its defence was completely routed by a small force of five hundred Norman horse. The Duke of Normandy, however, contented himself with burning the suburbs. He was either afraid to storm the walls, or determined upon a different policy. Leaving London, he divided his army, spreading it over the counties of Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire and Berkshire, and burned and destroyed all that could not conveniently be carried away.

Meanwhile, mistrust and division reigned among the councillors of the unfortunate Edgar, and the citizens attributed every new misfortune to the treachery or incapacity of his advisers. Rivalries and jealousies arose between Edwin and Morcar, and the

two earls finally left the city. Their departure deprived the military operations of all guidance or authority. Consternation was followed by panic, and Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, and first adviser of the king, was the first to throw himself on the mercy of the Conqueror. Meeting William as he crossed the Thames at Wallingford, he took the oath of fealty to him as his sovereign, and swore to support him in his pretensions. This defection was followed by that of others, and finally Edgar himself, at the head of an embassy, which was composed of Edwin and Morcar, on the part of the nobility; the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Worcester and Hereford, on the part of the clergy; and a deputation representing the principal citizens of London, proceeded to Birkhamstead, where they were received in audience by William himself, and swore allegiance to the Conqueror, at the same time tendering him the crown. This embassy to Birkhamstead was the last act in the story of the Saxon domination—a period of struggle, gradual growth, slow development of constitutional principles, and steadily-increasing commercial prosperity.

Though William's advent had been heralded, as it were, by blood and fire, rape and plunder, and even his coronation at Westminster made the occasion of a skirmish between his retainers and the citizens of the city, yet William sought to inaugurate his reign by just and peaceful measures, and London was not last

to obtain the benefits of his policy. From the day of his entry, the city seemed to acquire a new life. A charter was granted to London by the Conqueror by which he secured to the city all her liberties and other privileges. The charter was granted to William, bishop, and Gosfrith, portreeve, and is worded in a peculiar manner. Besides these two great officers, he greets "all the burghers in London, French or English." To them he wishes all peace and goodwill. The original of this charter—or perhaps it is a very ancient copy—is still preserved in the archives of Guildhall. Its full text is as follows: "William, king, greets William, bishop, and Gosfrith, portreeve, and all the burghers within London, French or English, friendly: and I do you to wit, that I will that ye be all law worthy, there were in king Edward's day. And I will that every child be his father's heir, after his father's day, and I will not endure that any man offer any wrong to you. God keep you."

The object of the charter is threefold, and the privileges granted thereby are inestimable, as may be seen. It, first of all, assures the citizens that they have naught to fear from the new dynasty, since he gives them friendly greeting; secondly, it grants that all the citizens should be "law worthy," by which is meant that they should enjoy the privileges of freedmen in the courts of justice—that is, the right of trial by jury or compurgators, a right which they had acquired under Edward the Confessor—and be worthy

of giving evidence in court, and entitled to the privilege of bringing in their friends and neighbors to do the same; thirdly, it grants the right of inheritance—a privilege contrary to the feudal constitution of the Normans, and, in fact, to the very spirit of feudalism.

Though ostensibly granting privileges, William secretly determined that, while the citizens might remain as strongly fortified as they could wish against foes from without, he would not permit them to maintain any defences against himself. To accomplish this end, he decided upon the erection of a great fortress, that he might control the whole of London, and he selected for that purpose that place where he could break the wall without weakening the defences of the city. Now it happened that just without the ditch, a little to the southeast, and beyond Billingsgate, a piece of foreshore existed. At this point of the wall was a large bastion, either of Roman origin or built in Saxon times from materials taken from older fortifications. It was here that William determined to break the wall, and replace the old bastion with his new-planned fortress. This so-called new tower, in reality a vast fortress, was planned to cover no less than twenty-six acres, of which twelve would be within the city limits and fourteen without; thus rather less than half would lie within the former city boundaries. When completed, William calculated that this formidable castle—for castle it practically was—would not only overawe the citizens, and place it completely be-

Tower of London

yo
hi
tr
p
n
s

i
n

yond their power, or even their thoughts, to revolt at his authority, but would also completely control the traffic of the river. Thus it would more than compensate in strength for the small portion of the wall removed and destroyed to make a way for its construction.

The building of the White Tower, which forms, as it were, the centre of the whole structure, was not commenced until some eleven years after the battle of Senlac, and the work of its erection was entrusted to Gundulf, a monk of the Abbey of Bec, in Normandy, who had just been consecrated Bishop of Rochester. Gundulf arrived in London in 1078, and sought quarters at the house of a friend, a certain Ædmer Anhænde. He applied himself at once to the work before him; but he began the construction of this vast pile of masonry on such a gigantic scale that, though he attained the advanced age of eighty-four years, and thus lived thirty years after the starting of the work, he did not see its completion.

The present external appearance of the Tower is doubtless very unlike what it originally was, and probably no fortress of its age has undergone greater transformations. The White Tower, however, is still in great part as Gundulf left it, though in 1663 the windows were altered to admit of more light; and Sir Christopher Wren, probably in the belief that the Tower had, in the first instance, been erected by Julius Cæsar, introduced classical keystones. It consists

brother, the Duke of York—a proposal which Blackenbury found strength to reject. And here also did the mortal remains of that illustrious Princess Elizabeth of York, consort of Henry VII., lay in state, previous to her magnificent funeral at Westminster.

The Council Chamber in the second story, which communicates directly with the triforium of the chapel, has also been the scene of a number of important historic events. Here it was that Richard II. was compelled to abdicate his crown in favor of Henry of Lancaster; and here also Hastings was denounced, arrested and hurried to the block by Richard III., the gallery, cut out of the solid wall, and which runs completely round the Council Chamber, serving for the concealment of the soldiery whom the king caused to be stationed there to carry out his intentions.

Beneath the chapel is a vaulted chamber, now known as Queen Elizabeth's Armory, and which, in reality, forms the crypt of St. John's Chapel. On the north side is a cell about ten feet in length and eight feet in width. These rooms were those in which Sir Walter Raleigh was imprisoned, and in which he wrote his "History of the World." And the stone stairway leading up to St. John's Chapel has an historical association no less valued, for at the foot of these stairs were found, in July, 1674, the skeletons of the two little murdered princes, sons of Edward IV. - These were removed in 1678 by the order of Charles II., and placed in Westminster Abbey, the

sarcophagus containing these royal relics being against the east wall of the north side of Henry VII.'s chapel. Still further down beneath the crypts are the vaults, in reality dungeons of the most dismal kind. Their names were indeed sufficiently suggestive of discomfort, for while one went by the name of "Cold Harbor," another bore the equally unpleasant appellation of "Little Ease." In this latter Guy Fawkes was for some little time confined. It was, in fact, but a mere hole in the wall, closed by a heavy door, and so small that the prisoner could neither lie down nor yet sit upright, so that he was compelled to remain in a cramped and bent-up condition. In still another dungeon Prince James of Scotland was confined in 1405. In still another was kept the rack, and here suspects and traitors could be pleasantly tortured, and confessions extracted, while their shrieks and screams were entirely unavailing and unheard.

The chapel and its appendages are, strange to say, the only walled chambers in the building, for all the other partitions are of wood; and it is equally remarkable that this, the keep of the royal castle, intended originally for at least a temporary residence of the sovereign, and a refuge in time of trouble, should have been built so as to possess only one fireplace, and none of the conveniences to be found in far less important Norman residences of very slightly later date. Considering the immense altitude of the rooms, which are twenty-one feet high, and the great difficulty of heat-

ing such apartments, even with modern appliances, and the presence of innumerable pillars and other supports for the roof, it can scarcely have been an agreeable abode for the sovereign and his family. In fact, so meagre were the arrangements for any kind of domestic comfort, that it was necessary to screen off partitions to secure any privacy for the ladies. It was never therefore a pleasant, or even possible, residence for the court, which came instead to be permanently established at Westminster. Up to the time of Charles II. it was customary, however, for the British sovereign to spend the days immediately preceding the coronation in the Tower, which thus remained for several centuries at least a temporary and extraordinary residence of the sovereign, and certain apartments continued to be specially reserved for this purpose. Here he or she, as the case might be, was supposed to enter into a spiritual retreat, and prepare for the sacrament of the anointment. But with Charles II. the custom, which had been revived for his coronation, became obsolete, and the White Tower, originally the keep of the royal castle, became, in turn, prison, storehouse for the reception of archives and records of State, until these were removed in 1857 to the new Record Office, and was finally assigned to its present use—that of a museum of armory. When in use as a storehouse for archives, the White Tower became the temporary residence of many a learned and distinguished antiquary. Lambert, Sel-

Armory, Tower of London

den and the Republican Prynne are among those who lived and labored within its walls, while the northeast turret was used by Flamstead for astronomical observations until the erection of the Greenwich Observatory. To-day the upper stories of the White Tower are occupied exclusively by the museum of armory already mentioned, which contains one of the finest collections of armor extant, affording a faithful and chronological picture of English war array from the time of Edward I. to that of James II.

To the original structure, as planned by William of Normandy, and erected under the direction of the monk Gundulf, immense additions, consisting of outlying buildings, were made in subsequent reigns, until it came to be that the White Tower was completely surrounded by buildings, constructed at different times, these being again encircled by a great outer wall, and the whole pentagonal structure, covering an area of some eighteen acres, being in turn surrounded by a moat, at present dry and used for a parade or drill ground. The surrounding buildings of the so-called Inner Ward, and which were once used as State prisons, are now barracks; but the twelve towers, so famous because of the illustrious prisoners therein confined, still retain their historical associations. Their names, in fact, are in many instances closely connected with the misfortunes of their occupants. Thus Bloody Tower begets its name from the fact that Edward V. and his brother, the Duke of

Armory, Tower of London

York, commonly known in poetic parlance as "the little princes of the Tower," were imprisoned there, and there assassinated by the order of Richard III.; while in Bell Tower the Princess Elizabeth was confined by her sister, Queen Mary. It also witnessed the imprisonment of Lady Arabella Stewart, who was confined here for some years. Beauchamp Tower, which was probably built in the thirteenth century, received its name from Thomas de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, who was confined here in 1397, previous to his banishment to the Isle of Man. Among other illustrious prisoners detained here may be mentioned Ann Boleyn, in 1554; John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, condemned to death for the part which he took in the conspiracy to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne, and who, though reprieved, died shortly after in his prison room; Lord Guildford Dudley, husband of Lady Jane Grey, in 1554; the unfortunate princess herself, who, during the agony of her prison hours, sought to pass the time by carving her name, "Jane," on the wall of her cell in 1554; Edmund and Arthur Poole, the great-grandsons of George, Duke of Clarence, and brother of Edward IV., who were imprisoned here from 1562 till their death; Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, who was beheaded in 1573 for aspiring to the hand of Mary, Queen of Scots; and Dr. John Store, Chancellor of Oxford University under Queen Mary, and especially known for his firm loyalty to Rome during the great struggles of that terrible

reign. He was executed at Tyburn for high treason in 1571.

Devereux Tower, which stands at the northwest angle of the inner Ballium wall, derives its name from Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, who was its most illustrious occupant. In Flint Tower the dungeons are of so terrible a character that it received, and has retained in common parlance the designation of "Little Hell." Bowyer Tower, which derives its name from the fact that it was formerly the residence of the king's bowyer, or "Master of the King's Bows," was the scene of the death of the Duke of Clarence, who, if popular belief is to be credited, on being given a choice of methods to be employed in his execution, elected drowning in a butt of malmsey, and was accordingly thus executed. Brick Tower was for some time the prison of Lady Jane Grey, though the principal part of her confinement was spent in Beauchamp Tower. Martin or Jewel Tower was formerly used as a place of safe-keeping for the regalia of England, which is now, however, kept in Wakefield Tower. Constable and Broad Arrow Towers served the same purpose at one time of their history, while Salt Tower, which is one of the most ancient, and probably of Norman origin, contains a curious sphere, on the walls of which are engraved the zodiacal signs, and which is the work of the famous astrologer and magician, Hugh Draper of Bristol, who, com-

mitted on the charge of sorcery, was here imprisoned in 1561.

Wakefield Tower, which derives its name from the imprisonment of the "Yorkists," is that in which are now kept the crown jewels. These are under the care of the Master of the Jewel House, an officer who is charged with the duty of custodian of the regalia. This officer has, as one of his prerogatives, the appointment of the king's goldsmith, and is esteemed the first knight bachelor of England, and accorded that precedence. The office was held by Thomas Cromwell, afterwards Earl of Essex. The perquisites were at one time very large, but came to be so greatly diminished after the restoration that Sir Gilbert Talbot, who then held the office, was permitted by the king to tax strangers for a small monetary consideration. The office is now in abeyance, and the custody of the jewels, as well as of the Tower itself, belongs to the Queen's Yeomen of the Guard, a corps composed of aged war veterans, who by their quaint dress add greatly to the historic interest of the scene. They are commonly spoken of as "beef-eaters"—which, it is almost needless to remark, is but a corruption of "*buffetiers*"—for when the Tower was a royal residence, their duties included attendance on the royal table. Around the Inner Ward, as it is called, and as it were encircling it, is an outer wall, also strengthened by towers, the most important of which, and first in point of interest, is St. Thomas'

Traitor's Gate, Tower of London

mother of the Duke of Monmouth; Sir William Davenant; George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham; Sir Harry Vane the Younger, Sir William Coventry, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Earl of Salisbury, 1670; William, Lord Russell, 1683; Algernon Sidney, 1683; the Lord Chancellor Jeffreys, 1688; the great Duke of Marlborough, 1692; Sir Robert Walpole, 1712; Harley, Earl of Oxford, 1715; William Shippen, Bishop Atterbury, 1722; Dr. Freind, who here wrote his "History of Medicine;" the Earl of Derwentwater and Lord Kenmure, who were both executed on Tower Hill; the Earl of Nithsdale, who escaped from the Tower on February 28, 1715, dressed as a woman, in a cloak and hood provided by his wife, and which were for that reason for some time after called nithsdales; Lord Kilmarnock, Lord Balmerino, Lord Lovat, who perished at the block, on April 9, 1747, which block is still preserved in the armory; John Wilkes, 1752; Lord George Gordon, 1780; Sir Francis Burdett, 1810, and lastly the notorious Arthur Thistlewood, famous for his connection in the Cato Street conspiracy. Of the persons born in the Tower, the most noted are probably Carew Raleigh, son of Sir Walter Raleigh, Mrs. Hutchinson, the biographer of her husband, and the Countess of Bedford, daughter of the infamous Countess of Somerset, and mother of William, Lord Russell.

In building the Tower, William the Conqueror had, as we have seen, as his object the erection of a citadel

which would serve not only as a residence in time of danger, but as a fortress, from which a determined and organized resistance could be made in case of a rising against himself. Not satisfied with this move, however, he resolved to have, as it were, an accurate census of all the landowners in the kingdom, and of their possessions and privileges, that he might the better understand the situation and know best how to control them. To this end, he caused to be compiled the now famous Domesday Book. The reason for which London and its inhabitants are exempted from it is not very clear. It has been urged, as an explanation, that London was not a demesne, and was not held by any overlord whatsoever; but this is hardly satisfactory, and it seems difficult to reconcile the allowing of such a claim of independence with what we know of the character of the Conqueror. Whatever may be said, however, of William of Normandy, that his ambitions were destructive to his sense of justice, that his revengeful anger blinded him to all sense of charity, and that his avarice placed upon the people a heavier burden than they already bore, yet he was righteous in his administration, stern and inflexible in his will and undaunted in his courage, and to him London owed a renewed prosperity.

But he was as judicious an organizer as he was ambitious as a builder, and one of the principal municipal achievements of his reign was perhaps the establishment of a special quarter for the Jews. Many of

these unfortunates had followed in his wake from Rouen, and finding that the city was in a state of constant turmoil from the frays between them and the citizens, which were of almost daily occurrence, he decided that to separate them as much as was possible was essential to the peace and good government of the city. Accordingly a certain space was allotted to them as a place of residence, and in which to conduct their business. Their limitations were practically those of one street, then a lane, running from the north side of the Poultry to what is now Gresham Street, and a short distance down those lanes which led immediately out of it on either hand. From the fact that the Jews subsequently sought more congenial and obscure quarters, in the neighborhood of the Tower, the street of which we have spoken came as early as 1270 to be called the Old Jewry, to distinguish it from the New Jewry, their then actual habitation.

The most distinguishing feature of William of Normandy's reign, at least as regards its influence on the character of the city's development, was the establishment under his auspices of several of those great monastic institutions which were subsequently so numerous, and which rose to such wealth and power as to become, according to opinion, the glory and pride of the royal city of England, or the overshadow which threatened the city's liberties and intellectual and economic progression. Already, in the last year of

the Saxon rule, the College of St. Martin-le-Grand had, as we have seen, in 1056, been established, and the Conqueror confirmed its rights in the second year of his reign, and gave the dean and secular clergy connected therewith more land, and added to their privileges. In 1082 a number of monks of the great Monastic Order of St. Benedict, quite distinct from those already at Westminster, came over to England—if not by William's express invitation, at least with his permission and under his august patronage—and, establishing themselves at Bermondsey (Bearmund-ey or Island), there founded a house of their illustrious order. This house, which was an offshoot, as it were, of the famous Abbey of Cluny, was dependent for its government and its support on the mother house in France. The foundation was greatly facilitated by the beneficent assistance and protection of one Aylwin Child, a citizen of London, to whom, in fact, entire credit is often given for the establishment itself.

This famous abbey, for abbey it soon became, was, as has been said, in Bermondsey—a river parish on the Surrey side in the hundred of Brixton. It shortly acquired special renown in connection with the famous cross which was the site of many pilgrimages from the city itself and the neighboring towns. The cross seems to have been situated on the spot which is now the conjunction of Bermondsey and Tooley Streets, adjoining the present London Bridge terminus of the

London, Chatham and Dover Railway. In 1094 William II., surnamed Rufus, son of the Conqueror, gave the manor of Bermondsey to the abbey, which retained possession of the same until the dissolution of the religious houses under Henry VIII.

To the foundation of the abbey of Bermondsey other monastic foundations soon followed, and, with these, a great change was made in the character of the city and its neighborhood, and London, which had in Saxon times presented only a rather mean aggregation of unimportant houses, with some scattered church edifices of more or less architectural merit, came now to be a city possessing features of considerable architectural proportions and distinction. What the city gained in one way it lost, however, in another. With the removal of Edward the Confessor and his court to Westminster, the position of London as the royal city of England had begun to change. After the advent of William of Normandy it came to be completely altered; for while the building of the Tower would impress one with the idea that he intended that to be and to remain the principal residence of the sovereign, yet actually the kings and queens made only a very occasional stay in the city, and it ceased to be in any sense the royal residence. The palace of Æthelstan and of the later Anglo-Saxon kings existed, it is true, up to the first of the great fires, but it was untenanted, and though William and his successors, when they had any very special business in the city, resided at

the Tower, yet Westminster was in fact the royal seat and their principal habitation.

The Conqueror died on the 9th of September, 1087, and was succeeded by his son William, surnamed Rufus, on account of his red hair. He continued the great works of his father at the Tower and throughout the city, and entered even upon greater works at Westminster. Appreciating the great inconveniences experienced by the court and its retainers while sojourning in the Tower, and how absolutely inadequate would be its accommodations even when completed, he decided upon the erection at Westminster of a palace which would be suitable as a royal residence, and combine the conditions necessary in those turbulent times of a stronghold, with all the comforts then obtainable of a regal habitation. It was to meet these requirements that the new palace of Westminster was commenced by him adjoining that which owed its erection to Edward the Confessor.

Of this famous palace, the principal seat of the kings of England from the time of the Conquest to that of Henry VIII., only Westminster Hall and the crypts of St. Stephen's Chapel remain. Westminster Hall was built by William Rufus, and is supposed to have had a nave and aisles divided by timber ports. The hall, which became the principal banqueting-room of the palace, was enlarged and heightened under Richard II., who caused the walls to be carried up two feet higher, the windows altered, a new roof con-

structed and a stately porch added. These improvements were entrusted by Richard II. to Henry de Teveley, one of the most famous master masons of the time. The stone moulding, or string course, which runs around the hall is preserved to this day, and exhibits the white hart couchant—that favorite device of Richard II. The roof is still the same which was set up by Henry de Teveley, and, with its oak hammer beams, carved with angels, held to be one of the finest of its kind in England. In describing it, it has been spoken of as “cobwebless beams,” in reference to a popular tradition that spiders cannot live in Irish oak. This noble hall, which is two hundred and ninety feet in length by sixty-eight in breadth, and which is said to be one of the largest apartments in the world unsupported by pillars, besides being the banqueting-hall of the palace, was that wherein the Grand Councils of the king and the early Parliaments were held. Here the Law Courts were formerly opened, the Court of the Exchequer at the entrance end, and the King’s Bench and Courts of Chancery at the end opposite; and here, in more spacious chambers erected by Sir John Soane, a little to the west of Westminster Hall, they continued to be held until they were finally removed to the new Law Courts in 1882. These courts were: The High Court of Chancery, presided over by the Lord Chancellor; the Court of the King or Queen’s Bench, in which the Lord Chief Justice sat; the Court of the Common

Pleas, presided over by the Lord Chief Justice, and the Court of the Exchequer, presided over by the Lord Chief Baron.

Besides the Law Courts, however, Westminster Hall seems also to have harbored the stalls of any number of booksellers, law stationers, sempstresses, and dealers in all manner of toys and small wares, the rents and profits of which stalls belonged by an ancient right to that officer who is known as the Warden of the Fleet. It is difficult, indeed, for the modern mind to picture the curious confusion which must have prevailed in an agglomeration so varied and peculiar, and in such a singular mixture of solemnity and quaint frivolity. The scene would doubtless have been distressing to every one trained to habits of method and symmetry. Yet here some of the great scenes of history were enacted. Here, on a scaffolding erected for the purpose, Ann Boleyn sat, a witness to her trial, where Sir William Wallace and Sir Thomas More had stood before the bar; and here, again, the great Protector Somerset listened to his doom. Here the notorious Earl and Countess of Somerset, in the days of James I., stood trial for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Here sat the so-called High Court of Justice while that lamentable and disgraceful farce, the trial of Charles I., was enacted; and here sat the king and martyr, with the Naseby banners above his head. Here the astrologer Lily, who was present on that great occasion, saw the

silver top fall from the king's staff; and those near her heard Lady Fairfax exclaim, when her husband's name was called, "He has more wit than to be here!" Here the king's most relentless adversary, the usurper Cromwell, had himself proclaimed as Lord Protector; and here, only four years later, was his head brought, to be set up on a pole at the top of the hall, fronting the palace yard, flanked by the skulls of other traitors. Here, in the reign of James II., the seven bishops were acquitted; and here the great preacher, Dr. Sacheverel, was tried and found guilty by a majority of seventeen. Here the rebel lords, Kilmarnock, Lovat and Balmerino, were heard and condemned in 1745. Here Lord Byron, Lord Ferrers and the infamous Duchess of Kingston were tried, the first for killing Mr. Chaworth, the second for the murder of his steward, and the third for bigamy. Here Warren Hastings was tried, and Burke and Sheridan grew eloquent in his prosecution and defence; and here, again, Lord Mellville was tried, in 1806. This was the last public trial in Westminster Hall. This famous hall, which served successively as banqueting-room and court of justice, was the scene of the coronation banquet of English sovereigns down to the accession of George IV., whose coronation banquet was the last served, with all the mediæval ceremonial, in this ancient and historic chamber.

St. Stephen's Chapel was added to the palace under Stephen I., for a dean and canons. The chapel was

rebuilt in the reign of Edward II., between 1320 and 1322, and was regarded until its destruction as a very excellent example of decorated architecture. It served as the Hall of Assembly of the Commons, while the Lords assembled in what was the old Court of Requests. The crypt and the chapel of Westminster Hall are to-day the only remains of the old palace, which was almost totally destroyed by fire in 1512; and Henry VIII., after Wolsey's disgrace, moved to the latter's palace at Whitehall, which thenceforth became the royal residence, until the court removed to St. James'. Portions of the old palace, however, remained until the burning of the Houses of Parliament, in 1834, in which the famous Painted Chamber, the Star Chamber, St. Stephen's Chapel and the cloisters, the cellar of Guy Fawkes celebrity, the renowned Armada Hangings, and other remaining vestiges of the original building, were destroyed. Other apartments of the old palace were designated as the Antioch Chamber, the Caged Chamber, the Chamber of the Holy Ghost, the Great Exchequer Chamber, and other names equally fanciful or descriptive.

The reign of William II. had commenced under unpleasant auspices. The second of the great London fires had caused much loss and consternation in the city, and the Cathedral Church of St. Paul had for the second time suffered destruction under flames. Burned in 961, under Edgar, surnamed the Peaceable, it had been rebuilt almost within a year; nor was

William II. less forward in his zeal for its prompt reconstruction. Indeed, he did much for the ecclesiastical edifice, not only in the city, but at Westminster. The burden of these works was shared by the city and county alike, and so great were they that the chronicle has it that on the arrival in London of Henry I., after William's death, he was made to swear, before they would crown him, that he would withdraw all further taxes for construction.

Just how far the city was concerned in the election of Henry, which occurred at Winchester, it is difficult to say, but that he owed it some debt of gratitude is evident by the privileges and liberties which he granted and conferred upon the citizens. William II. was killed on Thursday, August 2, 1100. He was buried next day in the Cathedral of Winchester. On Saturday Henry entered London, and his coronation took place on Sunday, the day following.

Henry's charter was, perhaps, even more important in the history of the city's liberties than that of his father, William of Normandy; for, not only did he absolve the citizens from the payment of any of the various forms of feudal service and fines, but he granted to the city the revenues of Middlesex, turned the entire county over to them to farm as they saw fit, preserving the payment of the merely nominal rent of three hundred pounds per annum, and permitted them the appointment of a sheriff to receive demesne dues. They had already acquired the right of elect-

ing their own portreeve and sheriff. This was an additional privilege. They were also given leave to appoint their own justiciar, that they might be relieved of ever having to appeal to any court outside the city. This officer has been held to have had the authority which in 1189 devolved upon the mayor; but it is more likely that the office of portreeve more closely resembled the subsequent mayoralty, and, indeed, the sheriffs of London and Middlesex were his deputies, as they afterwards became those of the mayor. Besides the privileges already mentioned, they were accorded the royal privilege of hunting in the forests of Middlesex and the Chiltern Hills.

But Henry did not confine his generosity to the city or its citizens, for he gave a charter to the Augustinian Priory of the Holy Trinity at Aldgate, which had been founded by Matilda, his wife, transferring to it thereby the privileges of the old Knighten Guild, which has been already mentioned as having come into existence under Æthelstan; and the prior of the fraternity attached to the church was at the same time an alderman and the presiding officer of the guild. But Holy Trinity was not the only religious house to profit by Henry's generosity, for the Augustinian Priory of St. Mary Overies, in Southwark, was largely helped to its prosperity by the king's patronage. This priory belonged to the Order of the Regular Canons of St. Augustin, and had been established in 1106, through the efforts and munificence of two

Norman knights, William Pont de l'Arche and William Dawncey; while the priory church, which was dedicated to the Holy Saviour, was built in the same year by the efforts of Giffard, Bishop of Winchester. The adjoining chapel was erected in 1238 by Peter de Rupibus, then Bishop of Winchester. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, another Bishop of Winchester, Cardinal Beaufort, son of John of Gaunt, spent large sums of money on improvements and repairs; and it was in this church that, on February 2, 1424-'25, the marriage of James I. of Scotland and Joanna Beaufort was celebrated with much pomp and ceremony, while the marriage feast was held in the neighboring palace of the Bishop of Winchester. But a few years later—that is, in 1469—under Henry de Burton, prior, the stone roof of the nave fell in, and was replaced by a wooden one, which lasted until the last century.

By far the most important, however, of the great monastic establishments which had their origin in the reign of Henry I. was that of St. Bartholomew the Great. This famous priory, which stood somewhat to the northwest of the city, near Aldersgate, near Smithfield, was founded by a certain Rahere, a gentleman of gentle lineage, who had been converted to a religious life while on a pilgrimage at Rome, and there joined the Order of the Regular Canons of St. Augustin. On his return to England, he founded a community of that order; and, connected with the priory,

was established at the same time that hospital which obtained subsequently such historic renown. The hospital had an independent constitution and separate estate, but for purposes of control and government was under the priory. It had a master, eight brethren and four sisters, and its community was also under the rule of St. Augustin. It was from its foundation a hospital for the sick, not a mere almshouse, as is sometimes supposed, and this is distinctly asserted in a grant of privileges made to it by Edward III. The relations of the priory to the hospital were revised by several bishops of London—that is, by Richard de Ely, who held the episcopal authority in 1197; by Eustace de Falconberg in 1224; and again by Simon de Sudbury in 1373—the two foundations being finally separated in 1537, at the dissolution of the priory.

The priory church was also founded by the same Rahere and at the same time, and completed in 1123. Though not the oldest foundation, since the Saxon foundations antedate it by several centuries, yet, as most of these suffered either destruction or severe damage in succeeding fires, and were either torn down or rebuilt, the Church of St. Bartholomew the Great is probably the oldest church edifice in London. It is so closely surrounded by houses that visitors often seek it in vain when only a few yards from it. A dilapidated, but still beautiful gateway, of early English style, leads from near the end of Duke Street

into the church. This gateway is overhung by a comparatively modern red-brick house, and though the pillars of the archway have disappeared, part of their circular capitals remain, and the so-called tooth mouldings which adorn the arch itself are in themselves indicative of its age, and show that this venerable entrance is coeval with the barons' war. The interior, while solemn in its simplicity, is nevertheless impressive. Of the four styles of architecture which are to be found in England, none, in fact, is more impressive than the Norman. The round arches and huge circular piers of the period are productive of strong architectural effects, and seem indicative, even more so than the Gothic, perhaps, of an awe born of a powerful and undying faith. The church contains many tombs and monuments, the principal of which is, of course, that of the founder itself, Rahere, the first prior. It stands in the easternmost bay, before the apse on the north side. The effigy represents Rahere, with the clean-shaven crown and the black robe of a Regular Canon of St. Augustin. His well-defined features show him to have been a man of distinguished intelligence and personality. His hands are in the attitude of prayer, and an angel at his feet holds a shield, bearing two lions, passant gardant, and two crowns.

As is natural, so ancient an edifice has undergone a variety of vicissitudes, and many changes were attempted and some few effected in its long history. It

was the last prior, a certain Bolton, who endeavored to change the character of the edifice, transforming the Norman into the perpendicular, as William de Wyckham did for the Winchester Cathedral. To this end, he caused to be constructed a new nave in the perpendicular style of architecture, and spoiled the apse, cut the corbels of the western tower arch into perpendicular mouldings, destroying the bolder and more appropriate Norman corbel table which matched that still preserved to us in the eastern arch. Strange to say, it is his alterations which, in the course of ages, have met with annihilation, so that all that has been destroyed was more modern than what remains, and we see the church much as it was at the time of the founder's death in 1143. The tower was built, however, as late as 1628, and the whole edifice, which had fallen into a grievous state of disrepair, was restored, under the directions of Mr. T. Hayter Lewis and Mr. William Slater, in 1863-'66. The old work was, as far as possible, left untouched. Again, in 1885, another most important restoration, that of the apse, was commenced from a design of Mr. Ashon Webb.

Adjoining the church is the old graveyard. The bases of some early English pillars on the right of the pathway indicate the existence at one time of a continuous building from the Smithfield gate to the church itself. There was a graveyard here in the days of the Romans, though the principal place of Roman sepul-

ture was where, between Bishopsgate and Bethnal Green, the Hospital of St. Mary Spital was afterwards founded, yet no inconsiderable number must have found a final resting-place at Smithfield, as the cinerary urns and large stone sarcophagi of the later Roman period discovered during excavations indicate. The latest of these discoveries was made in 1877, when two Roman sarcophagi of Oxfordshire oölite were brought to light where the library of St. Bartholomew now stands.

Not only did the monastic foundations of men largely increase under the beneficent reign of Henry I., but nunneries, the corresponding establishments for women, sprang up in every direction, of which the two most important were the Benedictine Nunnery of St. Mary at Clerkenwell and the Benedictine Nunnery of St. John the Baptist at Halliwell, near Shoreditch. Nor was the religious zeal of the women of the period lessened when the king's consort, Matilda of Scotland, interested herself personally in all manner of charitable works and religious foundations. We have already seen that the Priory of the Holy Trinity at Aldgate owed its foundation to her beneficence, and it was presumably to her influence that it obtained the valuable privileges which Henry I. conferred upon it in a special charter. She did not confine herself, however, to one act of this kind, for to her also does the hospital for lepers at St. Giles in the Fields owe its foundation.

During this same reign, so auspicious for foundations of every kind, those military monks, the Knights of St. John and the Knights Templar, sought a home in England, and established themselves in London. The first of these great orders of chivalry had originated in Jerusalem in 1048, and owed its origin to the hospice of St. John of Jerusalem, which was founded in that year by some merchants of Amalfi for the reception of pilgrims from Europe who visited the Holy Sepulchre, and to the religious congregation of lay brothers connected with the said hospice and known as the Brothers Hospitallers of St. John the Baptist in Jerusalem. The Turks having succeeded, however, the Saracens in Palestine, the hospice was plundered, the brethren imprisoned, and on the conquest of Jerusalem by Godfrey de Bouillon, in 1099, their first superior, Gerard, had been found in prison. Released from confinement, he had resumed his duties, and the order over which he had presided had been joined by some of the Crusaders, who desired to devote themselves to the care of poor and suffering pilgrims. By Gerard's advice, the brethren took the vow of poverty, chastity and obedience; and Pascal II., then Pope, gave his official sanction to the establishment of the order in A.D. 1113. Gerard was succeeded, in 1120, by a certain Ruggiero, who was in turn succeeded, on his death in 1131, by the famous Raymond du Puy, who drew up a body of statutes for the order based on the rules of St. Basil and St. Benedict, partaking

Inner Temple and Garden

to the splendid, and as they thought permanent, home which they had erected for themselves, near the Fleet, and which from them came to be known as the Temple.

That Henry I. was both just and beneficent we have had already ample proof; it is left but to add that his justice and charity were only equalled by his love of the beautiful and his taste in art and letters. That this was due greatly to the influence of each of his consorts in turn is very probable, for we learn that both were women of cultured minds, and that while the poets hastened to the court of Matilda of Westminster, to enjoy there her hospitality, read her their verses and seek her patronage, in later years the influence of Alice of Louvain was none the less marked on the art and manners of the times.

Under Stephen of Blois, who may be said to have usurped the throne and who held it for some nineteen years, the whole structure of society was again shaken to its foundation. Turbulence and anarchy succeeded to order and discipline, and the court itself fell into a condition analogous to that of the rest of the country. The citizens of London had every reason to regret the alacrity with which they had hailed him as king on the death of Henry, in detriment to the claims and title of Matilda, his daughter, and her infant son, Henry Plantagenet. London, however, kept her promise to the king of her choice, but Stephen failed to keep his to her. The annals of his reign are a

terrible record of wars and robberies, and, as though to prove the old maxim, "misfortunes never come alone," the elements seemed also in league against the city, for in 1136, the year after Stephen had assumed the reins of government, the third of London's great fires devastated a large part of the city. The fire started near London Stone, adjoining the church of St. Swithin, in the very heart of the city. It spread westward along the Watling Street as far as St. Paul's, where it destroyed the shrine of St. Erkenwald; then, turning eastward, it spread itself in the direction of London Bridge, which it completely consumed, so that that great relic of Roman and Saxon London was entirely destroyed. A few years later Stephen, after a reign filled with vicissitudes and military disasters, died. With him the Norman line came to an end, and Henry Plantagenet ascended the throne.

In reviewing the Norman period, and its influence on London, the most striking thing, perhaps, is the immense growth and influence of the ecclesiastical establishment, especially in reference to the foundation of monastic and other religious houses, and the valuable privileges and endowments obtained by them—privileges and endowments which came to be even more important under the succeeding dynasty. The principal churches of Norman foundation, not connected with any of the monastic and other religious establishments already alluded to, were those of St. Mary the Virgin (Aldermanbury), and St. Helen's,

usually called Great St. Helen's. The first of these was erected about 1116, a little to the north of the city, on what is now the north side of Love Lane, Cripplegate. It suffered destruction in the great fire of 1666, and was, with so many others, rebuilt under Sir Christopher Wren. The second was, if popular tradition be credited, founded in 1145. It was and is now situated on what has come to be known as Great St. Helen's Place, on the east side of Bishopsgate Street Within. The church was at first simply a parish church, but, in 1212, when, by the munificence of a certain William, son of William the Goldsmith, the Priory of the Nuns of St. Helen was established in the immediate neighborhood, a new church was erected, which was connected with the priory and dependent thereon, and which served the double purpose of oratory for the priory and the parish church.

Another Norman foundation was that of St. Giles, just outside the walls, near Cripplegate, erected as early as 1090, during the reign of William II. by a certain Alfune, afterwards first hospitaller of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. The church, however, having fallen into great disrepair, was rebuilt late in the fourteenth century. This second edifice was much injured by the fire of 1545, and the church had therefore to be a third time reconstructed. Other foundations, though these were connected with hospitals, were St. Alphage, by London Wall, and St. Katherine, by the Tower. The former of these was connected with

the priory and hospital of St. Mary the Virgin, founded by one William Elsyng, "for the sustentation of one hundred blind men." Spital (to whom we owe the term of Spitalfields) was the first prior. The original St. Alphage, which was situated near Aldersgate, was in existence as early as 1068. In the reign of Henry VIII. it had come to be in a ruinous condition, and the parishioners petitioned to be allowed to rebuild it. This was not granted, but the king let them have the chapel of St. Mary Elsyng for the sum of one hundred pounds a year. The old church was then pulled down, and some of the materials sold, while the remainder were used to repair the chapel.

The foundation of St. Katherine by the Tower took place in 1148. This free chapel was connected with a royal hospital and college, all three of which had been founded by Matilda of Boulogne, consort of Stephen I. It was greatly enlarged in 1273, by Eleanor of Castile, consort of Edward I., and again by Philippa of Hainault, consort of Edward III. The hospital and college, which had been placed perpetually under the patronage of the royal consorts of England, suffered the fate of the other religious houses under Henry VIII., but was in a measure re-established by Elizabeth. The church or chapel, of decorated Gothic, stood on the east side of what was then called St. Katherine's Court, close to the Thames, a little below the Irongate of the Tower,

and therefore without the city walls. It was a fine building, about sixty-nine feet in length and sixty feet in width, with a choir sixty-three feet in length and twenty-three feet wide, divided by a handsome Gothic screen. The construction of St. Katherine's docks compelled its removal, and services were held in the church for the last time on October 30, 1823.

That society during the Norman period was in a very crude state, and remained so under the Plantagenets, there is every evidence to prove; yet, as we have already seen, both of the consorts of Henry I. were women of culture and refinement, who attracted to their court many men of wit and learning, and while the Saxon period may truthfully be said to have produced only two great names in literary annals—the venerable Bede and the famous Cædmon—to the Norman period we owe quite a number of illustrious names. It was during the reign of Henry I. that Geoffrey of Monmouth produced his wonderful “*Historye*” of Britain, to which we owe an account, interesting though not veracious, of pre-Roman Britain, and which was embellished also by marvellous tales concerning Arthur and the equally celebrated Knights of the Round Table. It was almost simultaneously with this that the so-called *Chronicle of Turpin* made its first appearance, and also the Alexandrian romances by the pretended Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis, which were introduced into England by returning Crusaders. Thus the reign of Henry I. and

that of his successor saw the birth, as it were, of romantic literature, which for centuries aroused enthusiasm throughout Europe ; and not only were poets and historians welcomed at court, but under Matilda of Scotland, Alice of Louvain, and the illustrious consort of Stephen I., Matilda of Boulogne, the very foundations were laid of that elegant structure called modern society.

CHAPTER V.

LONDON UNDER THE PLANTAGENETS.

Accession of Henry II.—The New Dynasty—Thomas á Becket—Completion of London Bridge—The Building of the Temple—The Church of St. John—Richard I. and the Crusades—Leprosy in London—The Founding of St. James' Hospital—King John—The Great Charter—The Craft-Guilds—The Weavers' Company—Guild Hall—The First Mayor of London—Serlo le Mercer—Accession of Henry—Building of the Savoy—Development of the Ecclesiastical Establishments—Westminster Abbey—The Dominicans in London—Blackfriars in Castle Baynard—Arrival of the Franciscans—Greyfriars at Newgate—The Carthusians in Chancery Lane—Arrival of the Carmelites—Whitefriars—The Old and the New Jewries—Rag Fair—Simon de Montford—The Rise of the Companies—They Obtain Charters from Walter Harvey, Mayor—Eleanor of Castile—Charing Cross—Marriage of Edward I. and Margaret of France—Civic Pageants—Tilts and Tournaments—The King Grants Charters to the Companies—Their Rules and Regulations—The Charter of Maces—The Lord Mayor of London—The Wards—The Wards Without—The Companies Erect their own Halls—The Power of the Church—The Bishop of London—The New St. Paul's—The Parishes—The Parishes Without—The Churches—Extant Plantagenet Churches—Great St. Helen's—St. Giles (Cripplegate)—Arrival of the Cistercians—East Minster—Foundation of the Charter House—Dissolution of the Knights Templar—The Inns of Court—The Inner, Middle and Outer Temple—Lincoln's Inn—Gray's Inn—Their Rules and Regulations—City Improvements—Street Architecture in Plantagenet Times—Condition of the Cheap—The

Development of Social Life—The Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace—The Archbishop of York at Whitehall—Rochester House—Durham House—Ely House—Civic Entertaining—Amusements of the Citizens—The Beginnings of the Tavern as an Institution—The Albion Tavern at Aldersgate—The Horn Tavern at the Fleet—The Cock Tavern—Westminster—The White Hart, Southwark—The Tabard and the Canterbury Pilgrims—Letters in the Plantagenet Days.

WHEN Henry Plantagenet ascended the throne, under the name of Henry II., he came into those rights of which, it was claimed by his adherents, he had long been unjustly deprived; for, when dying, Henry I., in 1135, leaving no male issue, had bequeathed the crown to his daughter Matilda, widow of Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, whom he had caused to marry in second nuptials Geoffrey Plantagenet, Earl of Anjou, and thus Henry became the rightful claimant to the throne, he being her son by her second husband. The seizure of the crown by the late king's nephew, Stephen, son of his sister Adela, wife of Stephen, Earl of Blois, was—though supported by some of the barons, who disliked the idea of a woman, in the person of Matilda, ascending the throne—held to be illegal, as contrary both to Anglo-Saxon and Norman custom and tradition. Whatever may have been the abstract merits of the case, it certainly ended in a desperate struggle, which was only terminated by the truce of Wallingford in 1153. During all this time London had been frequently the scene of the strife, and the consequences upon the

city had been of a very demoralizing nature. Law and order, justice and authority, were constantly set at naught by the ever-varying stages of the game.

The Londoners were literally torn from one side to the other in the struggle. Matilda, when at one time she became mistress of the situation, sought to punish them for their former allegiance to Stephen by depriving them of all their liberties. She rescinded the grants that her father and grandfather had made to the city, and even went so far as to give Middlesex to the Earl of Essex to farm, granting him the Tower of London as his castle, appointing him at the same time to the sheriffship of London, as well as of Middlesex, and to the office of justiciar; so that no person could hold any pleas in either city or county without his sanction. By this monstrous act she did what the Londoners had always feared would occur—that is, she destroyed at one blow all their privileges, reducing them to the position of a “*demesne*,” with an overlord entitled to plunder and oppress at will. As may be supposed, the citizens were immediately aroused, and a deputation was sent to Winchester, where the estates of the realm had been assembled to recognize Matilda as Queen of England. Here they clamored loudly for the release of Stephen, then in prison; for even the evils of his reign were as naught to the then existing state of things. Notwithstanding the representations made to her at St. Albans by a special deputation sent to her by her adherents within the

Coronation Chair, Westminster Abbey

city, she determined upon proceeding to the capital; and there, while she succeeded in compelling a respectful reception, the citizens hoping for a repeal of the offensive enactments, she behaved in such a manner, and so disdained their petitions, as to antagonize even her best friends, and was finally compelled to retire.

With the accession of Henry II., London's day of triumph came. Henry, however, proved himself quite equal to the idea entertained of his abilities, and his first acts augured a return of that justice and tranquillity of which the city, and, in fact, the entire kingdom, had for so very long been deprived. He at once dismissed the mercenaries, who had been brought together to protect their interests by his predecessors, and revoked all unjust measures made by Stephen, and those which had been attempted by his mother, or, as her partisans claim, forced upon her by the stress of circumstances. He reformed the coin, and was both stern and just in his suppression of robbery and violence; and again granted to London and its citizens those liberties and privileges of which they had been deprived during the preceding reign. Never, in fact, did reign open more auspiciously. With his accession, a new life, as well as a new dynasty, had its beginning. It was claimed for London by a contemporary writer that it possessed at this time "the most wholesome of climates, the most fortunate situation, the strongest of fortresses, the most chaste of matrons, the most honorable, just and pious of citizens, and

among them the greatest number of then living illustrious names."

In fact, even with allowance for the buoyancy of this exordium, everything seemed to prognosticate, as it were, the great movements of the thirteenth century, and the very buoyancy thus alluded to would have seemed to have indicated a certain newness and freshness of surrounding. And indeed the city, though still encircled by its ancient walls, was, in truth, in a large measure new, for the destruction caused by the fire of 1136 had compelled vast works of reconstruction. The Londoners, feeling more sure of their position and secure in their rights and privileges, gave themselves up to peaceful occupations of commerce and the arts of trade. They had weathered the storm, and come out victorious from under the heel of oppression. Everywhere and in everything there seemed to sound the bugle-note of a new life. Bishop Fitzmeal was arduously at work at a codification of the laws; Ralph de Diss was engaged in his deanery on his epitome of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and the curate of Colechurch, a certain Peter, who had in 1176 been commissioned by Henry to undertake the task, was completing his plans for the new bridge which was to immortalize him. London Bridge had, through floods and fires, suffered so severely that it was held to be decidedly unsafe. The king, therefore, determined that, instead of constantly recurring repairs, a completely new bridge should be

erected. Thus did the last vestige of the old Roman and Saxon bridge, which had served such useful purpose, disappear, and a stone structure span the river instead.

Here must we pause to give a passing tribute to a remarkable man. Simultaneously almost with the accession of Henry II., there arose in England a man, who while he cannot perhaps be said to belong properly speaking to the history of England's greatest city, yet from the high position in both Church and State which he attained, and the great influence which he exercised over the king and the greatest minds of his time, deserves special mention. This man was Thomas à Becket, Archbishop, Chancellor and martyr. The son of a London merchant, he showed at an early age a rare taste and aptitude for literary and philosophical pursuits. Having interested Theobald, then Archbishop of Canterbury, he was sent to study at Oxford and at Bologna. On his return from Italy, he entered the church, and rose rapidly to honors and distinction. In 1158, four years after his accession, he was made Chancellor by Henry II., and the following year accompanied the king on his journey to France, with a large and splendid retinue. Three years later, in 1162, he became Archbishop of Canterbury. His resignation from the office of Chancellor, which occurred shortly afterwards, his controversy with the king concerning the limits of ecclesiastical and civil authority, his refusal to sign the "Constitu-

tions of Clarendon," his suspension from his high office, his flight to France, his subsequent reconciliation with Henry II., and finally his assassination at Canterbury, are all well-known pages in his history. In 1173 his canonization followed, and some fifty years later his remains were translated to a splendid shrine, which came to be loaded with rich offerings and to attract many pilgrims.

The new London Bridge in the meantime had been nearing its completion, and was finally declared finished in 1209. A chapel had already (in 1190) been erected in memory of St. Thomas à Becket on the spot where the house in which he was born had stood in Cheapside, and in conjunction with which a hospital had been founded, under the name of St. Thomas of Acon, by the deceased's sister, Agnes à Becket. The name of Acon had been appended because of the popular belief that Acon, or Acre, in Syria, had been captured by the Crusaders through his miraculous interposition. It was now thought suitable that a chapel to his memory should adorn the new bridge, and one was accordingly erected thereon. A row of houses sprang up on either side, so that the bridge was thus made to resemble a continuous street. At both extremities fortified gates gave access to the thoroughfare, and on the pinnacles of these it became customary to expose the heads of traitors. Nor were the houses, so romantically situated over the water's edge, without histories equally romantic. In one of

these there lived, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, Sir John Hewitt, then Lord Mayor; and, according to a much-believed tradition, his daughter one day, in leaning out of the window, fell into the river, from which she was rescued by a gallant youth, one Edward Osborne, apprentice to her father, who subsequently won and wed her whom he had rescued, and became the founder of the ducal house of Leeds.

The year 1170 saw the beginning of a construction perhaps equally celebrated as London Bridge—that vast pile of buildings which has in its aggregate come to be designated as the Temple. The Knights Templar had, as we have seen, established themselves in Holborn, beyond Newgate, during a preceding reign. They soon, however, found their temporary quarters both unpleasant and overcrowded, and they determined, therefore, to have a place of abode and worship suitable to their exalted station and distinguished aims. Thus commenced the erection of the Temple. The site selected was the river edge, between the city and Westminster, and a little to the west of the Fleet. Completed in 1184, the Knights Templar removed thither, and four years later we find them thoroughly at home and established in their new quarters. This great pile of buildings was divided into a so-called Inner, Middle and Outer Temple, in connection, it has been held, with their relative position in reference to the city—the Inner Temple being that which lay furthest to the east, and therefore the nearest to the

protection afforded by the city walls, while the Outer Temple was that which was nearest to Westminster, and therefore the furthest from the city. The most important buildings of the large aggregation of cloisters, chambers, armories, public halls and oratories was, as it remains to-day, the church of the Temple, which was the principal place of worship of the knights and their attendants, and is situated within the Inner Temple. It consists of two parts—the Round Church and the Choir.

The former, distinctly Norman in character, dates from 1185, as is testified to by an inscription in Saxon characters, formerly on the stonework over the little door next to the cloisters. It was dedicated to Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Choir, on the other hand, which is pure Early English, was not completed until 1240. On the suppression of the Order of the Templars under Edward II., in 1313, and when the Temple itself passed into the hands of the Benchers of the two societies of the Inner and Middle Temple, the church became the place of worship of these latter and of the students of the Common Law, and has so remained. The old edifice, one of the most interesting and noteworthy in London, sustained some damage by fire and other accidents at different times. It was, in part, rebuilt in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and the whole structure put into thorough repair in 1839–'42, in perfect twelfth and thirteenth century taste. The monuments were not all permitted to re-

main where they were originally erected, but in some instances were replaced to conform with architectural canons. Many have been removed to the triforium. The principal ones are of William, Earl of Pembroke, Earl Marshal and Lord Protector during the minority of Henry III. (died 1119), and a group of monumental effigies of Knights Templar, the names of which are uncertain. There are also monuments to the learned Selden and Plowden, the jurists, Richard Martin, to whom Jonson dedicates his *Poetaster*, James Howell, the letter-writer, and Edmund Gibbon. Lord Chancellor Thurlow is buried under the south aisle, while Oliver Goldsmith lies in the burial ground, east of the choir, without the church itself.

With the accession of Richard I., surnamed the Lion Heart (*Cœur de Lion*), who succeeded to his father without opposition, the chief magistrate of London assumed a new title, that of mayor. Henry Fitz-Aylwyn, or Fitz-Eylwyn, who was the first to enjoy this title, was a man remarkable for his rectitude and justice. He has wrongly been held responsible, however, for the riots which occurred at Richard's coronation, and the massacre of the Jews, which followed; but as the coronation of the king occurred on September 3, 1189, the massacre taking place the day following, and as the new sheriffs, Henry of Cornhill and Richard Fitz Reyner, only took their oaths on Michaelmas Day, September 29, everything would go towards proving that the new mayor,

unless, as is possible, he first acted in behalf of his fellow-citizens as butler at the coronation banquet, only came into office on the November 9 following.

Richard is usually known to fame as the hero of the Third Crusade, the champion of the oppressed in Palestine; but whatever he may have accomplished in the way of permanently benefitting Christians in the East—and it is doubtful if he was particularly successful in this direction—for his own country he did but little; and whatever may have been his martial qualities, we find but small record of his generosity or justice in his dealing with London and its citizens. The new life which had just sprung up was almost crushed by his exactions, and all breathed more freely when he had departed on his travels, leaving the administration of his kingdom to his Chancellor, Longchamps, Bishop of Ely, who immediately took up his residence in the Tower. The conduct of this prelate was not, however, such as to appease the anxiety of the citizens. He immediately commenced great works of defence, encroaching on the city boundaries thereby, and causing great alarm and offence to the citizens by so doing. But he still further enraged the public when he caused the Bishop of Durham, whom the king had designated as his co-regent, to be seized and imprisoned, and insulted Geoffrey, Archbishop of York. These acts brought the indignation of the nation to a climax, and John, the king's youngest brother, seeing therein a means of furthering his own

ambitions, lost no time in summoning a court about him, at the chapter house of St. Paul's, to consider the deposition of the regent. A letter from Richard, then at Messina, and which defined and limited the powers of the regent, was read aloud, and a deputation sent to the Tower to apprise Longchamps of the decision whereby he was removed. He immediately came to terms, and was permitted, in return, to cross the river to Bermondsey, from which place he escaped to the continent.

The adventures of Richard, his deeds of valor, the success of his arms against Saladin, his subsequent misfortunes, and his detention at the hands of Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, on the return journey, belong rather to the general history of his reign than to the chronicle of London events. Notwithstanding his long absence, he was warmly welcomed, however, on his return, and granted to the citizens a renewal of the charter of Henry II., a favor for which they doubtless paid heavily. The city was also burdened to pay a share of the king's ransom, and to defray the expenses of a second coronation, which took place on his return. A second time the citizens assembled to the ringing of the burghmote bell in the churchyard of St. Paul's, but the meeting did not avail, and a riot ensuing, a number of the citizens were slain. Their leader, a certain William Longbeard, whose real name was Fitz-Osbert, was apprehended and paid with his life the penalty of his leadership. In 1198

Richard granted a second charter, this one relating to the Thames Conservancy. A year later he died in Normandy of a wound received at the siege of the castle of Chaluz. Arthur, Duke of Brittany, the son and heir of his next brother Geoffrey, being a minor, the crown of England was assumed by Richard's youngest brother, John.

The reign of Richard, important though it may be to the historian of the Crusades, is but of slight importance in respect to its influence on the capital of England. The increased traffic with the East, brought about by the Crusades, and the return of the first knights from their chivalric venture, had, however, been largely instrumental in the importation and introduction into England of a variety of Oriental scourges, of which, perhaps, not the least alarming was that dread disease, the leprosy. In fact, so largely had the number of victims of this awful pestilence increased in London that it was held advisable, and indeed found necessary, as early as the first year of Richard's reign, to establish a hospital in which these unfortunates could find a shelter, and, while isolated from the rest of the community, receive proper care, treatment and attention. Thus, in the year 1190, was the Hospital of St. James for Lepers founded, in what was then a more or less isolated locality, to the west of the city and to the north of Westminster. This foundation was some centuries later transformed into a royal residence by Henry

VIII., and became the present St. James' Palace, in which his daughter Mary held her court and finally expired, and one portion of which, denominated York House, the present Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York made until recently their London residence.

Under John the struggle for liberty continued both in London and throughout the kingdom. Hardly was he seated on the throne, than "twenty of the more discreet men" were sworn together by the mayor to take counsel on behalf of the city. That this measure was productive of some results is evidenced by the granting of no less than five charters in years immediately following, and though of these some were unimportant and obtained only on heavy payments, yet by them certain privileges and advantages were derived. But the struggle was not altogether between the king and citizens. A great rivalry existed between the wealthier burgesses and the ordinary craftsmen, and the prudhommes were at every election arrayed against the latter. The wards were in the hands of the landowners, and the aldermen themselves were very much in the position of lords of manors. Their office, originally elective and for a specified term, had become indeterminate in its length of duration, and, to all intents and purposes, practically hereditary. These so-called "barons of the city" formed, in truth, an oligarchy, and practically controlled the whole machinery of civic government, the merchant guild, the revenues of the city and the

trade regulations. It was to fight this tyranny, this species of trust, that the craft guilds were at first organized. The craftsmen saw that, unless all of the same craft were joined together, their efforts at stemming the tide of oppression were worse than useless.

That guildship was of very great antiquity in London, and indeed in all the cities of England, we have historic evidence. We have already seen that a "*frithgild*" had come into existence as early as the days of Æthelstan, and the foundation of the Knighten-Guild, or Young Men's Guild of London, is attributed to Edgar. This guild, which obtained a charter from Edward the Confessor, was subsequently honored also by recognition by Henry I. At first the guilds were merely for the purposes of mutual help and encouragement among the members of the same craft. They were, in fact, originally founded to enable their members to comply most conveniently with the exactions of the frankpledge, which required of every freedman of fourteen years of age to find sureties for his good behavior. The price of life and limb was paid by the family or house of the wrongdoer to the family or house of the man wronged—the first effort, it may be said, of the then dawning civilization to make clear to all that a wrong to one man was a wrong to the community. As the fine or "*bloodwite*" was heavy, ten families combined together and formed themselves into a guild, all being equally responsible for an offence committed by any

member of the guild, though they had in return the privilege of acting as compurgators, who investigated the case, and by their attestations under oath in regard to the merits of the case were not infrequently of much influence in deciding the guilt or innocence of the accused. The members of each guild met once a month at dinner, partly for social purposes and to discuss business, partly to keep a watchful eye on one another; and by a natural process of evolution these "*frithgilds*" very soon developed into trade guilds, the members of which bound themselves not only to encourage trade mutually in times of prosperity, but also to assist the members in times of distress, to help them over embarrassments incurred by illness, to bury the indigent members, and to pay for masses for the repose of the souls of deceased brethren.

These guilds were of three kinds—religious, or purely social, mercantile, and lastly those of handicraftsmen. The latter had been founded really in self-defence, for the traders having grown powerful and somewhat tyrannical, the craftsmen were, as we have seen, actually driven, in their desperate efforts to obtain justice and their share of the city's government, to form craft guilds, as representing the commonalty, as opposed to the mercantile guilds, which represented the city aristocracy, or so-called "city barons." It was the same struggle, under different name, as that which is to-day still going on between trusts and labor unions. The guilds of handicrafts-

men had come to be eighteen in number. Their senior officer often bore the title of alderman, but this title had no connection with that of the municipal officer of that name. United though they might be in all things that bore on their fight against the mercantile guilds and the city magnates, they were not, however, always united among themselves. Thus the Goldsmiths would fall out with the Tailors, and the Tanners with the Cloth Merchants. The Weavers, on the other hand, because of their greater antiquity—an antiquity disputed only by the Saddlers—a guild of unquestioned Saxon origin, superior wealth and more perfect organization, excited the envy of the other guilds, and so the internecine war was continued. These latter (the Weavers) had succeeded in obtaining formal recognition from the crown, and as early as 1130 they had received a charter from Henry I., while a second or confirmatory charter was accorded them by Henry II. This interesting document, which bears the date of 1154, is rendered even more so, perhaps, by the fact that it bears the seal of Thomas à Becket. Later they obtained from Edward I. a charter so generous in its liberties that they assumed the right of almost independent self-government—a right which the municipal authorities could not possibly recognize, and a verdict against them and their pretensions was obtained in the following reign. It is probably in consequence of this that the Weavers' Guild came to be divided into that

of the Woollen Drapers, the Tailors, the Linen Armourers and others of the trade. Of such separate existence there is, however, no evidence before 1299, when the record of the Tailors' Company, which became that of the Merchant Tailors, commences.

The other guilds wishing now, in conformity to the example of the Weavers, to secure legally the privileges which they had acquired by prescription, and also to possess a legally recognized corporate existence, sought, by application to the crown, to obtain charters of incorporation, with the accompanying corporate rights. It cannot be said that they met with any very decided or immediate success. The royal executive was extremely reluctant to place any such instrument of power in the hands of any of the guilds; and no other charter was actually granted until the Goldsmiths, Skinners and Merchant Tailors obtained theirs in 1327 from Edward III. Indeed, their efforts to secure legal recognition had a result quite the contrary to that which they anticipated and hoped for. The influence of the mercantile party, or "city barons," did much to thwart their efforts, and instead of a legal recognition of corporate rights, they not only did not secure charters, but were actually heavily fined for not possessing them. This fine was imposed on all unchartered guilds as a species of annual tax, and marked a decided victory for the mercantile party and "city barons"; but while it has popularly been supposed that this measure had as its

result practically the dissolution of the handicraftsmen's guilds, such was not the case, and, in the same record which mentions the penalty above referred to, we find their names a little later. They came, however, possibly in consequence, to be all included in one general association or Town Guild, which had its place of meeting in a hall denominated Guildhall, which stood in Aldermanbury, near Cripplegate, very near the site of the present edifice.

The very tyrants who thus oppressed the craftsmen class in the city were among those who extorted the "Magna Charta" from John on June 15, 1215. Geoffrey Fitz-Piers was, in fact, a descendant of that first Geoffrey, the portreeve to whom William of Normandy addresses himself in his first charter. He only survived Henry Fitz-Alwyn, the first mayor, one year, but Archbishop Langton took his place at the head of the barons, and, on May 12, 1213, threw open the gates to their forces, led by Robert Fitz-Water, who was the standard-bearer of the city.

The great charter having, however, secured to the citizens some of their privileges and liberties, among which was that of electing their own mayor, the Commons, or popular party, determined that they also should enjoy some of the fruits of the struggle in which they had taken so important a part, and that the mayoralty and all the official places should in the future not be held by city barons. The election of Serlo le Mercer to the civic chair, the very year

of the signing of the "Magna Charta," is significant, inasmuch as he was the first member of a craft to secure the mayoralty. That he had no aristocratic surname is shown by the fact that he was known by his occupation. In the removal of Jacob Alderman from the mayoralty in 1216, and the substitution of Solomon de Basinges, we find a temporary triumph of the aristocratic party and a set back for the Commons; but Serlo le Mercer was again elected in 1217, and held the mayoralty for five consecutive years. He was succeeded, in 1227, by Roger le Duc, a man of old family and of what, if it is admissible to use here the Roman term, may be called the "patrician" party. All went peaceably the first year, but in the second of his administration a contest arose in regard to his two deputies, the sheriffs, Henry de Cockam and Stephen Bukerel, who were also of old and distinguished families, and had held office under Roger le Duc for two consecutive terms; and so strongly did the popular party make themselves felt that all the aldermen and principal citizens joined in an oath that in the future the same man should never serve as sheriff for two consecutive terms. Roger le Duc was succeeded in the civic chair by Andrew Bukerel in 1231, and the latter held office until 1238, when Richard Reinger was once more elected.

Meanwhile, however, Henry III., John's eldest son, had succeeded to the throne on the death of his father in 1216. As this prince ascended the throne

at the age of nine, it was some years before he was sufficiently mature to warrant an opinion of his character. As he grew to man's estate, and the real authority of the regal office devolved upon him, it was found that he was scarcely fitted by nature to hold in check and control his unruly barons. He was gentle, humane and merciful, but did not possess those qualities of force and convincing command which were essential to the successful ruler in those turbulent times. That he was in great need of money there seems to be no doubt. His military reverses, and the unsuccessful termination of several of his enterprises, had caused him serious financial embarrassment. Moreover, he had accepted from the Pope the crown of Sicily for his son Edmund, but had not the wherewithal to push his claims. His exactions from city and citizens became thus a severe burden. His consort, Eleanor of Provence, it was maintained had introduced a foreign influence at court. It was, in fact, for her uncle Peter, Count of Savoy, that Henry III., in 1245, caused to be constructed Savoy Palace, on the northern bank of the Thames, between the city and Westminster, which palace became his English residence. He finally bestowed it, however, on the fraternity of Montjoy ("Fratres de Monte Jovis"), by whom it was converted into a priory of their order, and thus came to be known as the Priory of Cornuto by Havering, at the Bower in Essex. It was bought of the friars by Eleanor herself, as a resi-

dence for Edmund, Earl of Lancaster. In 1293 a license to castellate was obtained. The whole place was altered and reconstructed by Henry, fourth Earl and first Duke of Lancaster; and here John, King of France, was detained after the battle of Poitiers. The palace was sacked and burned by Wat Tyler and his followers in 1391, and seems to have lain quite neglected until 1505, when Henry VII. endowed it as a hospital for the relief of one hundred poor people, and dedicated the new foundation to St. John the Baptist. The hospital was suppressed in 1553, under Edward VI., but re-endowed by Mary, and continued to be maintained as a hospital until the first year of the reign of Queen Anne, when it was finally dissolved. In 1666 it was here that the sick and wounded of the great Dutch War were lodged and cared for.

The last vestige of the palace and hospital buildings was destroyed in making the approaches to Waterloo Bridge, and nothing to-day remains but the chapel, which, though dedicated to St. Mary le Savoy, yet as part inheritance of the Duchy of Lancaster, and therefore crown property, is more usually called the Chapel Royal of the Savoy. The building was of the perpendicular style, and stood north and south. It was largely restored in 1505–1508, and almost rebuilt in 1721; again repaired in 1820, and again in 1843 and 1860. Largely damaged by fire in July, 1864, it was restored by Queen Victoria at her own expense;

and the work of reconstruction was achieved under the supervision of Mr. Sidney Smirke, R.A., the church being finally reopened for public worship by Dean Stanley on November 26, 1865. It has perhaps a special interest as the place where, on the Restoration, the "Savoy Conference"—that is, the meetings of the Commission appointed for the revision of the liturgy—was held in 1661 and 1662. Fuller, author of "The Worthies," was lecturer at the Savoy, and Cowley, the poet, and Doctor Killigrew, made famous in the poetry of Dryden, were among the candidates for the mastership, the latter being the successful candidate, and having eventually been buried in the chapel. Charles II. established a French church here, which is now removed to Bloomsbury Street. The present edifice is surrounded by commercial buildings, and thus stands quite hidden from the general passer-by between the Strand and the Thames Embankment. The great north window was filled with painted glass, at the expense of Queen Victoria, while that of the south was subscribed for by the parishioners, in commemoration of the recovery of the Prince of Wales, in 1872. There are a number of more or less interesting monuments, including ones to the Countess of Dalhousie, daughter of Sir Allen Apsley, Lieutenant of the Tower, the Countess of Nottingham, Dr. Killigrew and his daughter Anne, Sir Richard and Lady Rokeby; besides brasses to Gawain Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld, translator of Virgil—this brass serving

also for Bishop Halsal—to William Chaworth, and a tablet, erected by his widow, to Richard Lander, the African explorer.

If Henry's reign was characterized by much turbulence and disturbance, it was also conspicuous for the peaceful development of the monastic establishment, and those monastic foundations which had come into existence during preceding reigns expanded both in wealth and influence. In the case of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, commonly called of Westminster Abbey, it being contiguous to the royal palace itself, the king had taken the matter personally in hand. By him the Church of Edward the Confessor, which had fallen into disrepair, was almost entirely rebuilt, and the splendid edifice which is still with us to-day is that which we owe to the munificence and noble initiative of Henry III. The church itself is in the form of a Latin cross, and with the exception of the chapel of Edward the Confessor, and a few other doubtful remains, and the western towers, which were added by Wren, is Early English. The principal entrance is by the west portal, though the abbey may be also entered by the portal in the north transept, or that in the south transept, near the Poets' Corner. On entering, one is struck at once with the great impressiveness of the interior, and one steps, as it were, cautiously about, fearful of breaking in upon so many centuries of hallowed silence, or of awakening the echo of so many past glories and pious traditions. The

Screen in King Henry VII's Chapel,
Westminster Abbey

with Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., whereby the houses of York and Lancaster came to be united. The chapel contains the stalls of the Knights of the Order of the Bath, and the lower seats are for their squires; but the special glory of the chapel is the ceiling, with its curious fan tracery and fantastic pendentives, each surface being covered with a fine fretwork, illustrative of the most luxuriant period of the perpendicular style. Here we find the tombs of Henry VII. himself and his wife Elizabeth of York, which occupy the centre of the chapel, and are enclosed in a chantry of brass. In the same vault beneath, James I. is also laid at rest, while George II. and quite a number of the present dynasty have been interred without monuments in the vault immediately in front of that in which Henry VIII. lies. Around the central tomb, against the partition walls, as it were, are the tombs of George, Duke of Buckingham (assassinated 1628); John, Duke of Buckingham (died 1807); Lewis, Duke of Richmond (died 1623); Esme Stuart (died 1661); and lastly, that of the Duke of Montpensier, brother of Louis Phillippe, king of the French (died 1809). The two so-called aisles, adjoining the chapel on either side, contain the following tombs: that on the right, the tombs of Mary, Queen of the Scots; of Margaret, Countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII. (died 1509); Lady Margaret Douglas, his grand-daughter (died 1577); George, Duke of Albemarle (died 1670); and of Lady Wal-

pole (died 1737); while in the vault beneath are buried Charles II., Queen Mary II. and her consort, William of Orange; Queen Anne and her consort, George of Denmark; that on the left, the tombs of Queen Elizabeth; of Edward V. and his brother, the Duke of York, the murdered "Princes of the Tower"; Mary, daughter of James I. (died 1607); Sophia, daughter of James I. (died 1607); George, Marquis of Halifax (died 1695); and of Charles, Earl of Halifax (1715). The latter was distinguished both as lord keeper of the privy seal and as patron of Addison.

In the chapels surrounding that of Edward the Confessor—that is, those dedicated to the so called Edmund, "King of the East Angles," St. Nicholas, St. Paul and St. John the Baptist—are also many tombs or monuments, the most important of which are perhaps those of Prince John, second son of Edward II. (died 1334), and of Mary, Duchess of Suffolk, grandmother of Lady Jane Grey (died 1558), in the Chapel of St. Edmund; of Philippa, Duchess of York, wife of Edward, Duke of York, who fell at Agincourt (died 1431), and of Anne, Duchess of Somerset, wife of the Protector and sister of Jane Seymour, third wife of Henry VIII. (died 1582), in the Chapel of St. Nicholas; of James Watt, the great mechanician and improver of the steam engine (died 1819), and of Sir Rowland Hill, the originator of the system of penny postage (died 1879), in

the Chapel of St. Paul; and of William of Colchester, Thomas Milyng and Gustave Fascet, abbots of Westminster (died in 1420, 1492 and 1500, respectively), and Thomas, Earl of Exeter, privy councillor under James I., and his wife (died 1622), in the Chapel of St. John the Baptist.

The choir extends beyond the transepts into the nave. The fine woodwork is that which was placed there in 1848. In the transepts, as in the aisles of the choir and of the nave, are the tombs and monuments of many distinguished persons. Thus in the north transept are the monuments of William, Earl of Chatham (died 1778); William, Earl of Mansfield (died 1793); George Canning (died 1827); Henry, Viscount Palmerston (died 1865); and Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (died 1881). In the north aisle, those of Sir Isaac Newton (died 1726); William Pitt, the renowned statesman (died 1806); William Wilberforce, the great advocate of the emancipation of the slaves (died 1833); and Henry, Lord Holland (died 1840). In the south aisle, the monuments of William Congreve, the great dramatist (died 1728); Dr. Isaac Watts, the famous divine (died 1748); Major André (executed in America, 1780); John Wesley, founder of the Methodists (died 1791); and of William Wordsworth, the poet (died 1850). Finally, in the south transept, of which a portion is commonly called the "Poets' Corner," are the monuments of Geoffrey Chaucer (died 1400), Edmund Spenser (died 1598),

Shakespeare (died 1616), Michael Drayton (died 1631), Ben Jonson (died 1637), Milton (died 1674), Samuel Butler (died 1680), Dryden (died 1700), Addison (died 1710), James Thomson, the poet of the seasons (died 1748); Handel, the composer (died 1759); Thomas Gray (died 1771), Oliver Goldsmith (died 1774), David Garrick, the great actor (died 1779); Robert Burns (died 1796), Robert Southey (died 1843), Macaulay (died 1859), Thackeray (died 1863), Charles Dickens (died 1870), George Grote, the historian of Greece (died 1871), and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the American poet (died in 1882).

The ancient chapter house adjoining the abbey church, and which had been erected in 1250, was not disturbed by Henry III. in his alterations, and is therefore considerably older than the body of the church itself. To the south of the entrance of the chapter house is the entrance of the Chapel of the Pyx, the name given to the box in which the standards of gold and silver were kept, and which was once the treasury of the kings of England; while opposite the entrance of the chapter house is the staircase ascending to the Muniment Room or Archives of the Abbey, and to the triforium, from which a splendid view of the interior may be had. It is in the Jerusalem Chamber, to the southwest of the abbey church, that the sovereigns of England have donned their robes of state, prior to proceeding into the church for their coronation. It contains five

frescoes, portraying the death of Henry IV. and the coronation of Queen Victoria. The great repairs and alterations undertaken by Henry III. were extended also to Westminster Hall, and, while John by his charter had there established the Common Pleas, Henry III. fixed the King's Bench also at Westminster Hall.

It must not be supposed that it was only Westminster Abbey which profited by the patronage and encouragement of Henry III., for not only did existing monastic foundations attain greater development during his beneficent reign, but new foundations sprang up on all sides. Already, as early as 1210, Herbert de Bergh had, it is related, given his house (afterwards Whitehall) to some friars of the then recently-founded Order of St. Dominic. This they subsequently sold, however, to Gray, Archbishop of York, and it remained until the days of Wolsey the London residence of the Archbishops of York. The order had as yet not obtained its official confirmation, and did not succeed in this until 1216, when it was formally confirmed by Honorius III. This perhaps accounts for the fact that there does not appear any official record of their presence in England until the arrival, in 1221, of Gilbert de Fraxineto and the thirteen friars who accompanied him. On their arrival in London they were assigned a piece of ground "without the wall of the city, by Oldbourne (Holborn), and near unto the Temple," and here they

erected buildings and established a priory. The friars, however, do not seem to have been satisfied with their quarters, and, after fifty-five years of residence, they removed from Holborn to a piece of ground which the then mayor, Gregory de Rokesle, caused to be set aside for their use in the ward of Castle Baynard.

This ward was so called from Castle Baynard, which in turn derived its name from Ralph Bainerdus, a Norman associate of William the Conqueror, by whom it was erected. It was forfeited, however, in 1111, by William Baynard, Baron of Dunmow, and was granted by Henry I. to Robert Fitzgerald, son of Gilbert, Earl of Clare. In 1213 Robert Fitzwalter, who had succeeded to the castle, was, for taking part with the barons, banished from the realm, and the castle dismantled; but a year or two later he was recalled and pardoned, and the king even went so far as to declare him the rightful chief bannerer and castellan of the city of London. It was the site of this castle which came to be included in the precinct of Blackfriars, as the Dominican friars soon came to be called, because of the sombre hue of their scapular, thereby to distinguish them from the friars of other orders who had foundations in London—not that of the Castle Baynard of later origin. The latter, erected in 1428 by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, was built on land also on the banks of the Thames, below Thames Street, but within the city. On the

attainder of the Duke of Gloucester, it reverted to the crown, in whose possession it remained until the reign of Elizabeth, by whom it was leased to the Earl of Pembroke. Here it was, in 1483, that that great council of nobles and prelates who had assembled together to arrange for the coronation of Edward V. met from day to day; and here it was therefore that, after the murder of Hastings, Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, offered the crown to Richard III. Here it was that Henry VII. and his consort lodged and refreshed themselves on the occasion of their several visits of ceremony to the city; here, in 1503, lodged the King of Castile, on his visit to England; and here, in 1553, did the great council of the State meet to proclaim the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VIII., Queen of England. The castle was, as we have said, leased by Queen Elizabeth to the Earl of Pembroke; and here the brothers to whom the folio of Shakespeare was dedicated—William, Earl of Pembroke, and Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery—were in 1641 respectively installed as Chancellors of the University of Oxford; and here the latter's second wife, Anne, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery, resided, while her husband, as Lord Chamberlain, lived at the Cockpit in Whitehall. Already in 1720, we are told, "only a round tower, part of Baynard's Castle," remained, and, with fragments of other outlying buildings, had been converted into private dwellings. To-day no trace is left

of the historic pile, though the memory of it is still preserved in the name of the ward of Castle Baynard, and in the sign of a new tavern which has recently been erected, at the corner of St. Andrew's Hill, in Queen Victoria Street.

The Castle Baynard, which was included within the precincts of Blackfriars, was, as we have seen, however, in a much more westerly situation. To the privileges obtained from the then mayor, Gregory de Rokesle, they secured large contributions from Robert Kilwardly, then Archbishop of Canterbury, towards the building of their church, St. Anne, Blackfriars; and Edward I., by a charter granted in 1311, confirmed to them the gift of Castle Baynard and the Tower of Mountfichet. In fact, he went so far as to allow the friars to pull down the city wall, so as to take in all the land to the west as far as the Fleet; and thus was formed that precinct which came to be known as Blackfriars, and which has given its name not only to the district, but to Blackfriars Bridge. Edward I. and his consort, Eleanor of Castile, also liberally contributed to the endowment of the priory itself, the most distinguishing feature of which was its great hall, in which more than one solemn assemblage of notable ecclesiastics was held. Here it was, on January 17, 1382, that that great assemblage sat, which had been summoned together by William Courtenay, then Archbishop of Canterbury, to examine and condemn the twenty-four articles drawn from the

writings of Wycliffe. There were present ten bishops, thirty doctors of theology, six doctors and four bachelors of laws, besides other important personages, and the proceedings were at their height, when the whole assembly was much shaken up by an earthquake, from which the council came to be called the "Earthquake Council." Here it was also that the divorce of Henry VIII. from his august consort, Katherine of Arragon, was tried before the papal legate, Cardinal Campeggio.

The establishment of the Dominicans at Holborn, their first resting-place, had been promptly followed by the advent in London of nine friars of the then also recently-founded Order of St. Francis, commonly called "Greyfriars," from the color of their habit. Of these nine who landed at Dover, in the eighth year of the reign of Henry III.—that is, in 1223-'24—five settled in Canterbury and four came on to London. For the first fifteen days after their arrival, the latter enjoyed the hospitality of the Dominicans in Holborn, at the expiration of which time, having acquired the good will of the then mayor, one Richard Renger, they removed to Cornhill, where they at once established themselves. Their next move was to a piece of land off Newgate, near St. Nicholas Shambles, where a certain John Ewyn, mercer, had donated to them a space of ground. Here they erected a large number of buildings, including a church, a chapter house, a dormitory, a refectory, an infirmary and

other conventual constructions, the expense being sustained by several citizens. Robert, Lord Lisle, became a friar of the order, and that famous Lord Mayor, Richard Whytington, caused to be erected at his expense a splendid library for their use. They thus found themselves, within two centuries of their first landing, in influential and affluent circumstances, and provided with every facility for fulfilling their mission.

Meanwhile the Order of the Carthusians had by Henry III. been established in 1233, in Chancery Lane, where they had founded a priory and house for the reception and maintenance of those Jews and infidels who were converted to the Christian faith. It was erected on the site of certain Jews' houses, which had been forfeited to the king, where now stand the chapel and office of the Rolls. The next to arrive in England were friars of the Order of Mount Carmel, commonly called Carmelites, or Whitefriars, on account of the color of their habit. They landed in 1241, and were hospitably received by Henry III., who assigned to them a certain precinct to the west of Blackfriars and to the east of the Temple, so that they were situated between the two. Among their greatest benefactors were one Richard Gray, knight, who bore the expense of building their church, Hugh Courtenay, Earl of Devon, who reconstructed it some years later, and Robert Marshall, Bishop of Hereford, who built the choir, presbytery and steeple. The

Austin friars, or friars of the Order of St. Augustin, were the next arrivals, some twelve years later, when in 1253 they founded a house in Old Broad Street, Broad Street Ward, and the last to arrive upon the scene were the so-called Crutched Friars, who, landing in 1298, founded a house between Jewry Street, Aldgate, and Mark Lane.

This Jewry Street is not to be confounded with the Jewry to the north of Cheapside, which was already by this time abandoned by the Jews, who had found more congenial, obscure and therefore undisturbed quarters near the Tower, and termed therefore the Old Jewry. They did not remain long, however, in quiet possession of their new settlement, for in 1291, under Edward I., they were all banished from the kingdom, and when they finally were allowed to return, they sought new quarters in and about Aldgate, which they have in a great measure inhabited up to the present time. In fact, Rag Fair, in the precincts behind the Tower and to the south of Whitechapel, derives its appellation from the mart of old clothes and second-hand raiment which is held there continuously, but more especially on Saturday evenings, when the street scene is, even to this day, well worth a visit.

The reign of Henry III. is perhaps of more than usual interest to a historian of the city's liberties, as it was during that period that, in the midst of the chaos and confusion which was the distinguishing char-

acteristic of those disorderly times, both in national and municipal politics, there arose a man who to the strength of his convictions united the ability to carry out his plans and bring them to a successful conclusion. This man was Thomas Fitz-Thomas. What Simon de Montfort was to national England Thomas Fitz-Thomas was to civic London. He had acted as sheriff under the mayor Ralph Hardel, in 1257, and the famous green seal-roll had been found at Windsor, and exploited during his term of office. In 1261 Thomas Fitz-Thomas was elected to the mayoralty, which office he retained for five consecutive years. It was during his term of office that Henry III., under the plea of illness, made his retreat to the French court, while Simon de Montfort was making his preparations to enforce the Provisions of Oxford; and the second year of his mayoralty was signalized by the endeavor made by the Constable of the Tower to exact "*prisage*" from vessels coming up the Thames with corn, an attempt defeated by the citizens under the leadership of Fitz-Thomas himself. His greatest achievement was, however, perhaps that whereby, when Simon de Montfort in the first flush of his success promised the citizens that if they would formulate such demands as would be to their advantage, he would secure for them their ratification by the king in council, Fitz-Thomas obtained the legalization of the trade guilds. If Fitz-Thomas was at once loyal to the crown and faithful to his trust as guar-

dian of the city's liberties, honor must, however, also be paid to the name of Walter Harvey, the political disciple of Fitz-Thomas. Harvey had held a sheriffship under him in the last year of his mayoralty, and was himself elected to that office in 1271. He it was who wielded the city mace when the death of Henry III. placed the latter's eldest son Edward I. upon the throne.

With the close of the reign of Henry III. a new era, as it were, began in the government of the city. The power of the great landowners was curtailed, and as such they ceased to have a voice in the municipal administration. The office of alderman became purely elective. The whole constitution of the city, as it were, underwent a change, and the oligarchy was definitely broken up. The great dread of the Londoners that they would, like the great cities of the continent, fall under the absolute control of the sovereign, had not come to pass, and the danger had been averted. Under these changed conditions, Walter Harvey succeeded in 1271 as wielder of the city mace and champion of popular rights. To him the city companies are largely indebted for their rise and influence. As we have seen, the handicraftsmen's guilds had failed in a former attempt to obtain a legal recognition of the rights which they had acquired by prescription by the grant of charters of incorporation. Harvey now decided that he would, as chief executive of the city, independently of the royal pleasure or

permission, grant charters of incorporation to the handicraftsmen's guilds, and by so doing called into existence a new and very potent civic and commercial force. It is true that he merely carried out the policy which Fitz-Thomas had inaugurated under Simon de Montfort; but, while said charters were subsequently forfeited and held to be invalid by the royal executive, who had been ignored in the matter, yet they gave to the companies corporate life, which even the subsequent forfeiture did not cause them to lose.

Such were the conditions which governed the city companies when Edward I. ascended the throne of England. Many of those advantages which they had gained during the reign of Henry III. and the mayoralty of Harvey, they lost during the succeeding reign. The rule of Edward I. in London was a stern one. No sooner had Harvey stepped from the civic throne than the validity of his charters was, as we have seen, called into question; and on New Year's day, 1274, two years after the accession of Edward I., at a great meeting held at the Guildhall, presided over by the mayor, Gregory de Rokesle, said charters were declared to be null and void, and the privileges granted therein to be non-existent. Harvey had, however, given to the companies a corporative life which it was not easy to destroy.

The year 1284 is the first in which we have the names of those members sent to represent the city in the nation's Parliament, which Edward I. had sum-

moned to meet at Shrewsbury. Of the representatives of the city, Henry le Waleys, then mayor, and Gregory de Rokesle, who had occupied the civic throne from 1274 to 1281, were the most distinguished. These two men were of great shrewdness and remarkable ability. The former was a wine merchant, and the latter a goldsmith and a wool merchant. Both had served as sheriffs together under the late king. Both had been in attendance on Edward I. when in Gascony, and had ruled the city during the first twelve years of the king's reign. But while they exerted a benevolent influence in many ways, and were themselves liberal and generous in their benefactions, having a large and lofty view of their duties as citizens, Waleys having, among other donations, given large sums for the erection of the old Christ Church in Newgate Street, while Rokesle had given largely towards the dormitories; yet both were too much engrossed in the pursuit of their private business to pay the proper amount of attention to the government of the city. The king, whether because he regarded them as too vigilant of the city's interests, or whether he was at that particular time playing into the hands of the Commons as against the city magnates, demanded that the mayor appear before the king's judges, then holding their assizes in the Tower, and answer for the "peace of the city."

This eventful June 29, 1284, Gregory de Rokesle, who again was mayor, donned his robes of office at

his house, which was situated in Milk Street, and proceeded in state to the Tower, followed by his sheriffs and aldermen, in full civic procession. At the entrance, however, he divested himself before crossing the drawbridge, and thus presented himself in plain citizen's clothes before John de Kirkby, who was sitting as judge of assize in the royal fortress. It was then that followed the oft-told scene in which Gregory de Rokesle declined to answer the questions which were put to him, on the ground that no law or precedent bound him to do so. What followed is equally well known. How, though he was allowed to withdraw unmolested, he, and a large number of citizens who had accompanied him, were arrested while attending a court of the king at Westminster, the day following, and he himself, and those who had accompanied him on the occasion of his journey to the Tower the preceding day, were actually imprisoned for several days, during which interval the king, adopting the plea that, Rokesle being imprisoned, the city was without a mayor, appointed Sir Ralph de Sandwich warden of the city. Nor was Rokesle permitted to resume his office. The office of mayor went therefore into temporary abeyance, and the functions of the city's chief magistrate continued to be administered by a king-appointed warden until 1296, when the king, being in great need of money, offered to restore the city's liberties for the sum of twenty-three thousand marks. The offer was accepted, and Henry

le Waleys stepped once more into the office he had so long occupied; and thus was the mayoralty re-established.

But Edward had other troubles besides disputes with civic officials, for in 1290 his beloved consort, Eleanor of Castile, died at Grantham. He decided that her funeral pageant should at least exhibit the true state of his feelings. It was a very grand affair. Twelve times did the funeral procession halt on its way from Grantham to Westminster Abbey. On each occasion great services were held, and at each of the twelve halting-places a monumental cross was erected. The twelfth stop was made about half-way between London and Westminster, at the place where the Charing Cross (sometimes said to be derived from "*chère reine*") monument is situated. The monument, designed and begun by one Roger de Crundale, was not completed when he died. The stone came from Caen, and the marble for the steps was brought from Corfe, in Dorsetshire. By the order of the Long Parliament, the crosses were ordered down May 3, 1643; but the order was evidently not put into effect as regards Charing Cross until four years later. The site of the cross was made the scene of a number of executions, notably those of four of the regicides. A monument in imitation of the original has, however, recently been set up, and stands in front of the Charing Cross terminus of the Southeastern Railway.

But if the funeral of Eleanor was made the occasion of splendid pageantry, the occasion of Edward's marriage with Margaret of France was made the reason for festivities of an equally brilliant character. A magnificent pageant was organized by the city of London, in which every guild was represented. The Fishmongers particularly distinguished themselves, a statue of St. Magnus, which formed, as it were, the central feature of their exhibit, being paraded with great pomp through the streets. In the description of the pageant we have the first distinct mention of the great livery companies, who, though unrecognized by royal charter, save in the instance of the Weavers, were honored by the royal thanks and many marked tokens of high consideration. The Weavers were again the most fortunate, for they obtained, as we have seen, a charter so liberal in its provisions that they were thereby led to overstep the limits of prudence in their pretensions, and suffered as has been related, in consequence, during the reign of Edward II., and the division of the guild followed. The reign of this monarch was a period of much turbulence and excitement. Disorders of various kinds disgraced the country, and gave evidence to the restlessness of the times. The city itself was in a state of great confusion. A certain John de Wentgrave kept the mayoralty for three years by illegal means. Popular outbreaks occurred constantly. The king seems to have made and unmade mayors at his pleasure.

Eleanor's Cross, Charing Cross

Nicholas de Farringdone and Hamo de Chigwell seem to have been veritable rivals for the mayoralty. In the difficulties between the king and the queen, Farringdone, who was a goldsmith and enormously wealthy, seems to have supported the queen's side, while Hamo de Chigwell sustained the king's faction. The former was in office in 1320, when the king, on some trumped excuse, deposed him, and appointed Chigwell in his place; while he in turn incurred the king's displeasure, and was replaced by Farringdone for the period of one year, and he it was who still held the mayoralty when Edward III. ascended the throne.

One of this young monarch's first acts was to grant a charter to the city which considerably enlarged the privileges already conferred upon the citizens. The mayor was then declared to be a justice of the goal of Newgate, from which it has been held that that official first obtained his title of "lord," though, in point of fact, no such grant was therein specifically expressed, and no such title was borne by London mayors until the days of Richard III. The mayor was by Edward's charter also made escheator of all lands, chattels and hereditaments within the city limits, the title to which was vitiated by forfeiture, or for other causes. Besides this, Southwark, while not actually brought into the city limits till the reign of Edward IV., was nevertheless brought under the authority of the mayor and his sheriffs, the village

being made over to the city as a fee farm. With these concessions to the city, Edward III. commenced a really glorious and a certainly gorgeous reign. If there are no records of riots and disturbances, there are, on the other hand, records of pageants, ceremonials, tournaments and imposing processions. Plumed and armored knights rode the streets, and heraldic banners floated from the windows. It was an age of enterprise and great results. It was a period of fighting and feasting, and examples of the lavish expenditure of the times exist in the great festivities with which Philippa of Hainault, the king's youthful bride, made her state entry into London, and of that great tournament which was held in the Cheap, when the boy king and his bride came into the city after the birth of their eldest son. Of both these great festivities descriptions have been preserved to us, and are a splendid and detailed record of the pageantry of the times.

Meanwhile the city companies grew steadily in power and influence. Edward III. was most liberally inclined towards them, and under his patronage the work of incorporation went on rapidly. No less than eight companies had obtained charters from him before the close of the reign. Thus the Goldsmiths, the Skinners, the Merchant Tailors, received charters in 1327—the year of his accession—the Grocers in 1345, the Saddlers in 1363, the Drapers and the Fishmongers in 1364, while the Founders were enrolled in

1365, though their actual working charter was only granted them by James I. in 1614. The Haberdashers had already been given official recognition in 1311, though a charter was not accorded them until 1447 by Henry VI., and their present working charter granted them by Henry VII. in 1601. The Blacksmiths were recognized in 1325, though subsequently united with the Spurriers, and incorporated as such by Queen Elizabeth in 1571, and re-incorporated under Charles I. in 1639. The Ironmongers were also first recognized as a guild under Edward III.—that is, in 1330—though they are mentioned in an ordinance regulating the trade of the city issued as early as the reign of Edward I.

It must not be supposed, however, that the granting of charters by the royal executive was always an act of enlightened policy. It was, in fact, frequently a purely business transaction, it being one of the methods by which sovereigns raised money for the necessary expenses incurred by the French and other foreign wars. On the other hand, monopoly, and the power to confine and regulate trade, were, of course, the real *raison d'être* of the city companies. No one who was not a member of a particular guild could exercise the craft over which that guild had protectory rights, either in London or Southwark. To secure this membership, such person was compelled to serve a seven years' apprenticeship. In return, however, the advantages obtained by such membership were

well worth waiting for. He was then secure against competition, for the official head and rulers of each guild decided the scale of prices. He was also secure from over-grinding work, for the same rulers also settled the working hours. He was finally secure against underselling by unlawful means, and inferior work, for the same rulers exercised the prerogative of examining all work turned out, and condemning the unsuitable. The rules of each company were drawn up in a species of constitution, which was solemnly confirmed at the Guildhall, and incorporated in the royal charters. Any disobedience to the constitution of the company, which was kept in the company's craft-box, and read once a year to the assembled members standing bareheaded, was punished by severe fine, and, as a final resort, disgrace and expulsion. The officers of the company were elected by the members themselves, and each had as good a chance as any of rising to official rank. Members found themselves protected from persecution or injustice, and, if they failed in life, they were supported by their brethren, and interred at their expense, while the masses for the repose of their souls were among the expenses also defrayed by the guild of which they were members; and finally, in 1284, each guild was represented by a certain number of members in the civic parliament.

Indeed, from being represented bodies, the companies, during the reign of Richard II., came to arro-

gate to themselves the right to define, as it were, the city's constitution, and gradually possessed themselves of the complete control of the municipal machine. It had been customary for each ward to elect its own alderman, and four, six or eight of its inhabitants, according to the size of the ward, to be members of the Common Council. A royal ordinance issued by Edward III. removed the power of nomination, if not of actual election, from the wards, and gave it to the companies; and it naturally followed that those who were nominated by the companies were invariably elected by the wards. By the "Charter of Maces" (Edward III., June 10, 1354)—the same by which, though not expressed therein, it is held that the mayor obtained his title of Lord Mayor—the king directed that the aldermen, whom it had been customary to choose annually, should be permitted to retain their offices during good behavior, while Richard II., in 1394, made the office a life one, and fixed the tax for refusing to serve at £500. But the Common Council had also been made to undergo a change; for, while it had always been customary that its members should number forty, in 1351, by the 25th Edward III., it was enacted that fifty-four councilmen should be elected, while in 1376 the number was again raised, this time to one hundred and fifty-six. This was presumably when the "Wards Without" were included in the city limits. Again, in 1383, in an ordinance made by the Lord Mayor, the aldermen and

the commonalty in council assembled, it was decreed that yearly, on St. Gregory's Day, the aldermen should be charged, fifteen days after, to meet and select from each ward four to become common councillors during the year following. This brought the number to two hundred and six, which it has remained to this day. As the aldermen were, as we have seen, elected on the nomination of the companies, and they in turn chose the common councillors, it may be easily seen how completely the companies had obtained control of the civic government. Just how far the formation of the city companies influenced the division of the city into wards it is difficult to say. London wards, exclusive of the wards without, were twenty-two in number, and derived their names principally from the adjoining gates or public places situated within them. Thus, following the line of London Wall, commencing with Tower Ward, which was that contiguous to the Tower, came Aldgate Ward, Bishopsgate Ward, Broad Street Ward, Coleman Street Ward, Bassishaw Ward, Cripplegate Ward, Aldersgate Ward, Farringdon Ward, which extended from Newgate and Ludgate to the Thames; and then, following the north bank of the river, Castle Baynard Ward, Queenhithe Ward, Vintry Ward, Dowgate Ward, Bridge Ward, Billingsgate Ward, which was thus contiguous to Tower Ward. In the centre of the city were Langbourne Ward, Cornhill Ward, Cheap Ward, Bread Street Ward and Cordwainers Ward, Walbrook Ward

and Candlewick Ward. To these was subsequently added Lime Street Ward, which was formed out of portions of Aldgate, Bishopsgate, Langbourne and Cornhill Wards.

The wards, however, only attained their final arrangement during the wardenship of Sir Ralph de Sandwich, when the immediate suburbs came also to be limited by ward divisions. In some cases new names were accorded to these; in others, the same as that of the ward immediately contiguous "within" the walls, the word "without" being added. Thus, beyond Aldgate lay Portsoken Ward; beyond Bishopsgate Ward Within lay Bishopsgate Ward Without. Coleman Street Ward was made to extend over the city boundaries, and to take in the adjoining space without the walls. Beyond Cripplegate Ward Within was Cripplegate Ward Without, and beyond Aldersgate Ward Within was Aldersgate Ward Without, while Farringdon Ward Without, which adjoined Farringdon Ward Within, included the whole district beyond Newgate and Ludgate, which comprised the Whitefriars, the Temple, St. Bride's, St. Dunstan's, as far as St. Clement Danes. This was the most important of the extra-mural wards, as it was traversed by the Fleet Street, which had become the most direct route between the city and the king's palace at Westminster. Later, under Edward VI., another ward was added, this one across the river, on the Southwark side, Bridge Ward Without.

Though, as we have seen, the larger proportion of the wards derived their names from the adjoining gates or public places situated near them, yet some did so distinctly from the trade guilds, now city companies, which had their headquarters within their limits. Thus the Vintners, the Bakers, the Cordwainers and the Candlewickers gave their names to the wards which were so called. With the rise of the companies into a position of such dominant power, they were no longer satisfied with holding their meetings in the General Guildhall, or in hired halls rented for the purpose. Several of the great companies determined therefore to erect their own places of assembly, and spacious so-called "halls" arose in different parts of the city, the companies vying with each other in the proportions of their halls and the splendor of their interior decorations.

The Mercers, who had been dislodged by extensive alterations and enlargements made to the Hospital of St. Thomas of Acon, now crossed to the other side of the Cheap, and there erected a hall, which remained their headquarters until the dissolution of the religious houses, when they obtained from Henry VIII. a grant of their old premises. The Skinners purchased from the king a house which had once been their headquarters, but in one of the civic revolutions had passed into private hands. After the split in the Weavers' Guild, the Drapers were for some time, as it were, without a home, but seemed to have had

headquarters at St. Mary Boathatch, a sort of lock gate or dock on the Walbrook at St. Mary Woolenhithe, and also in Broad Street. They soon migrated, however, to Cornhill, and from there to St. Swithin's Lane, where they remained until 1541, when they moved to their present quarters in Throgmorton Street. The Merchant Tailors, on the other hand, after they had severed their relations with the Weavers, established their headquarters in Cordwainers Ward, subsequently purchasing the ground and house, which are, with large alterations, still their present headquarters, in the lane to which their trade gives the name of Threadneedle Street. The Saddlers appear to have been connected from the very earliest times with St. Martin-le-Grand, and to have partaken more of a religious than of a mercantile character; while the Bakers and the Cordwainers had halls in Bread Street and Cordwainers Ward respectively. In some instances the residences of the old city families were found suitable for the purposes intended; and thus the mansions of the Basings, the Bukerels and the Lovekyns were transformed into guildhalls and assembly-rooms by the different city companies. Thus the house of Sir Nicholas de Segrave, whose brother had been bishop during the reign of Edward III., became the house of the Goldsmiths, who had, however, from the earliest time had their meeting-place or guild hall in Aldersgate Ward; while the mansion of Edward Crepin, in Cornhill, was that

which was acquired by the Merchant Tailors, who added to it the adjoining property of the Outwich family, and there erected Merchant Tailors' Hall.

If similarity of craft was the basic foundation of the city companies, there was, however, one guild which had nationality as its basic property. This was the German Guild, which included the greater proportion of the handicraftsmen of that nationality. They kept themselves near the river bank, where they owned a hall or place of meeting in that part of the city to the west of London Bridge and to the east of Castle Baynard, and therefore between the two, which bore the name of Steelyard. While based on the matter of nationality, yet there was much in this guild that was religious. The members lived celibate and ascetic lives, apart from their fellow-citizens, and there can be no doubt that they nurtured the love of the Fatherland until it became almost a religious mania, and that their one ambition was to return to their native country as soon as means and circumstances permitted.

If the power of the companies was vast at this time and attained formidable proportions under the Plantagenets, the influence of the Church upon the London of that day was of equal importance. The Bishop of London had in the days of Mellitus and Erkenwald been a very influential personage, and had retained much of his influence, in civil as well as religious matters, to the days to which we are refer-

ring. St. Paul's was of course the principal church of the city, and the bishop's church as well. It had, as we have seen, suffered greatly from the fire of 1087, but almost immediately work was started on a new edifice to take the place of the one injured. It was determined that the new church should be of stone, and as the fire had occurred just before the death of the Conqueror, he had himself directed that the stones of the ruined Palatine Tower, which stood by the Fleet, where Blackfriars afterwards was situated, should be used in the construction. This was his contribution to the building of the new church. Work, however, proceeded slowly, and the church was far from finished when it was again seriously damaged by fire in 1136. The work was resumed, however, after some time; but this time on a far more extensive scale. The spire is said to have been completed in 1221, and the choir finished in 1240. It was lengthened eastward in 1255, and reported as "nearly completed" in 1283. It had thus taken some two hundred years to build, and presented a singular architectural *melange*, furnishing examples of the Norman, Early English and the Decorated Schools. Indeed, subsequent additions and repairs carry it through the whole period of the Decorated and Perpendicular Schools. But those portions executed in this style were unimportant. It possessed a great central tower, and at the west end two massive bell-towers, which probably gave Wren his idea

when the church was finally rebuilt, after the great fire of 1666. The church is said to have been five hundred and ninety-six feet in length, one hundred and four feet in breadth, and one hundred and thirty feet from the base to the cornice of the roof, while possessing an interior height of ninety-three feet. The length of the choir is given as one hundred and five feet, and the height of the tower as two hundred and eighty-five feet, and the height of the spire two hundred and eight feet. There was a chapel at the east end dedicated to St. Mary the Virgin, with one to the north of it dedicated to St. George, and one to the south dedicated to St. Dunstan. The nave is described as having had twelve bays, and as being "very long" and "very noble," and the central tower seems to have been quite hollow, like a lantern, internally. The windows of the nave are said to have been very high and long, while a rich circular window gave light to the east end. The church contained a number of monuments. In the middle aisle of the nave, to the right, was that of Sir John Beauchamp, constable of Dover Castle (died 1358), which tomb was commonly called "Duke Humphrey's tomb." St. Dunstan's Chapel contained that of Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln; while on the north side of the choir was that of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, (died 1399). Later Sir Christopher Hatton was here interred, and a sumptuous monument erected over his grave; while Sir Philip Sydney, and his father-in-

St. Paul's Cathedral

law, Sir Francis Walsingham, were also here commemorated, each by an unpretending tablet.

Adjoining the church was the chapter house, completed in 1332, and to the northwest corner of the churchyard stood the Episcopal Palace. At the northeast end of the church, "about the middle of the churchyard," stood the famous Cross of St. Paul's, and here sermons were frequently, and political speeches occasionally, delivered. The churchyard was itself surrounded by a stone wall, for entrance to which there were six gate houses.

The parishes were in many ways divisions of the city quite equal in importance to the wards, but independent of them. Nor can it be said that each ward was divided into so many parishes, for the divisions in no way corresponded; the parishes in many cases overlapped from one ward to another. Roughly speaking, however, it is customary to refer to a parish as being in that ward in which the greater part of the area which it comprises is situated, and in which the parish church itself actually stands; thus, Tower Ward, Aldersgate Within, Vintry, Bridge Ward Within, and Bread Street Ward, may be said to have come to comprise each four parishes; while the wards of Aldgate, Coleman Street and Cordwainers Ward came each to be divided into three. Bishopsgate Ward Within, like Dowgate and Cornhill, came to have only two parishes; but Broad Street Ward, Cripplegate Ward Within, Castle Baynard, Walbrook

and Candlewick Wards came to be each under five parochial jurisdictions. Three wards—Farringdon Ward Within, Queenhithe and Cheap—came to include each no less than seven parishes; two wards—those of Billingsgate and Langbourne—to have six each, while one parish covered the whole ward of Bassishaw. It was not long, however, as has been said, before the extra-mural sites in the immediate vicinity of the city wall were brought within the city's jurisdiction, and divided likewise into wards. These were parochially disciplined after the same fashion, though entirely independent of the city parishes. All these parochial divisions remain practically unchanged to-day, with a very few alterations; for when in the reconstruction, which was effected after the great fire of 1666, some of the churches were not rebuilt, their parochial administration was simply given over to the authorities of the neighboring parish, and they were, as it were, "joined" thereto, but their ecclesiastical existence and territorial limitations were held to continue to exist in theory.

Where a parish had grown into proportions too formidable for satisfactory administration, it was, in many cases, divided up into a number of private chantries, each having parochial jurisdiction, and which came therefore, roughly speaking, to be enumerated with the parishes themselves. In some cases each division retained the name of the mother parish, but to distinguish it, an affix was thereunto appended.

Thus it is that we find in several instances a number of churches in close proximity to one another, each dedicated to the same saint. Thus in Queenhithe there came to be the parishes of St. Mary Mounthaw and St. Mary Somerset, while in the adjoining Castle Baynard Ward was that of St. Mary Magdalen, each having formed originally part of the same parish; while Cordwainers Ward came to contain the parishes of St. Mary le Bow and St. Mary Aldermary, the last mentioned of which was in all probability, as its name indicates, the oldest of all. Thus also two parishes in Queenhithe came to be dedicated to Saint Nicholas, with the difference that one came to be called St. Nicholas (Olave), and the other St. Nicholas (Cole Abbey). Of what had been originally the great parish of St. Katherine, which had extended over the greater part of Aldgate and Portsoken Wards, there came to be the parishes of St. Katherine by the Tower, St. Katherine Cree and St. Katherine Coleman.

In reconstructing a picture of London of the Plantagenet days the churches must indeed hold a very prominent place, not so much perhaps for their beauty as for their number. The terrible visitation of the plague of 1350 had had the effect of greatly increasing the religious foundations. Every mourner, and there were naturally many, had seemed to feel their grief assuaged, or the chance of eternal happiness for those for whom they mourned enhanced, by the dona-

tion of large sums for the erection of church edifices. Unfortunately these donations did not stipulate in the matter of church architecture, and the new edifices were therefore as plain and inartistic in appearance as those that had been built before. There were, of course, some noted exceptions, but they were few and far between.

That the Londoners had been frequently characterized as pious is no surprise to us, when we learn that in later Plantagenet days they already possessed one hundred and fourteen churches, besides twelve public chapels belonging to monastic foundations and other such institutions. In fact, two-thirds of the area of London was covered by churches, parochial or otherwise, abbeys, priories, monasteries, nunneries, friaries and convents. Of these one hundred and fourteen churches, ninety-five were situated within the walls, while the remainder were in the wards without. Of these ninety-five churches, nineteen—namely, All Hallows Barking, St. Dunstan in the East, St. Andrew Undershaft, St. Æthelburgha, St. Peter by the Cross (West Cheap), St. Mary Magdalen (Old Fish Street), St. Gregory by St. Paul's, St. Faith near St. Paul's, St. Peter (Paul's Wharf), St. Mary Somerset, Holy Trinity the Less, St. Magnus the Martyr, St. Botolph by the Bridge, St. Botolph (Botolph Lane), St. Peter upon Cornhill, St. Michael upon Cornhill, St. Stephen (Walbrook), St. Mary Bothaw, St. Swithin (London Stone)—were Saxon foundations; four—namely, St.

Olave (Hart Street), St. Olave (Jewry), St. Olave (Silver Street), and St. Edmund the King and Martyr—were Danish foundations ; while two—namely, Great St. Helen's and St. Mary Aldermary, though in reality Norman foundations—were actually Plantagenet edifices, as fire and divers damage had brought about a reconstruction of them in Plantagenet times.

Of the remaining sixty-nine churches, fourteen—namely, St. Katherine Cree, in the ward of Aldgate ; St. Martin Outwich, in Broad Street Ward ; St. Alban (Wood Street), St. Mary Magdalen (Milk Street), in Cripplegate Within ; St. Augustin (Watling Street) and St. Matthew (Friday Street), in Farringdon Ward Within ; St. James (Garlickhithe) and St. Michael (Paternoster Royal), in the ward of Vintry ; All Hallows the Great, in Dowgate Ward ; St. Mary Colechurch, St. Lawrence (Jewry) and All Hallows (Honey Lane), in Cheap, and St. Mary le Bow and St. Antholin, in Cordwainers Ward—were Plantagenet foundations, and belong more especially to the period whereof this chapter is intended to treat ; while other notable churches which shortly after sprang into existence and obtained no small degree of historic importance were those of St. Benet Fink, St. Bartholomew by the Exchange, and St. Christopher le Stocks, all three in Broad Street Ward ; St. Stephen, in Coleman Street Ward ; St. Mary (Aldermanbury), and St. Michael (Wood Street), in Cripplegate Ward Within ; St. Mary Staining, Sts. Anne and Agnes, in Alders-

gate Ward Within ; St. Martin (Ludgate), St. Michael le Quern, and St. Vedast (Foster Lane), in Farringdon Ward Within ; St. Andrew by the Wardrobe, in Castle Baynard Ward ; St. Michael, in the ward of Queenhithe ; St. Martin, in the ward of Vintry ; All Hallows the Great, in Dowgate Ward ; St. Benet (Gracechurch Street), in Bridge Ward Within ; St. Margaret (New Fish Street) and St. Margaret Pattens, in the ward of Billingsgate ; St. Gabriel (Fenchurch Street), All Hallows (Lombard Street) and St. Mary Woolnoth, in Langbourne Ward ; St. Mildred (Poultry), St. Martin Pomary and St. Benet Sherehog, in the ward of Cheap ; All Hallows, in Bread Street Ward ; St. Mary (Woolchurch Haw), in Walbrook Ward ; and St. Clement (East Cheap) and St. Michael (Crooked Lane), in Candlewick Ward.

Of all these churches, so famous in name and so important in the study of London history, only four remain—namely, All Hallows Barking, St. Olave (Hart Street), St. Æthelburgha and Great St. Helen's—which vie with St. Bartholomew the Great and St. Giles (Cripplegate) in age and historic interest. Two—namely, St. Andrew Undershaft and St. Katherine Cree—having become in a bad state of disrepair, had to be rebuilt, the former in 1520–1522, the latter in 1630–1632 ; and so, though they subsequently escaped the great fire, and are, in that, more ancient than any other of the existing London churches, yet they cannot rank in age or interest with the first four men-

tioned. Six others escaped the great fire; but of these, five—namely, St. Katherine Coleman, in Aldgate Ward, and St. Peter le Poer, St. Christopher le Stocks, St. Martin Outwich and All Hallows in the Wall, all four in Broad Street Ward—fell into such a sorry state that they had to be rebuilt; and of these five, the last two had to be subsequently taken down to make way for city improvements; while one, All Hallows Staining, in Tower Ward, came to be in such a dangerous condition that it actually fell down, and the remaining walls were pulled down in 1761. Eighty-five churches perished in the flames of 1666. Of these, forty-eight only were rebuilt, and ten of these were eventually pulled down to make way for city improvements, while the remaining thirty-seven were never rebuilt.

Of the four intra-mural churches that have come down to us, at least in part—for St. Bartholomew the Great and St. Giles (Cripplegate), being extra-mural churches, are not included in the present list—All Hallows Barking and St. Æthelburgha, being Saxon foundations, have already been spoken of in that connection; while St. Olave (Hart Street) has been spoken of in connection with the Danish period. There remains therefore of which to treat only Great St. Helen's, so often called the "Westminster of the City," because of the number and interest of the tombs and monuments contained therein. Though, as has been said, really a Norman foundation, the

church was rebuilt in 1212, and again enlarged and improved in 1308, through the munificence of one William Basing, sheriff of London, who added largely to its endowments. The church came to be connected with the adjoining Convent of the Nuns of St. Helen, and in this differed from other conventual churches also serving parochial purposes, they having been first conventual, and only converted to parochial uses at the time of the dissolution of the religious houses, while St. Helen's was first parochial and then conventual. After the dissolution of the religious houses, the partition between that part which was used by the nuns and that part which served the parish was taken down, and the whole church once more turned over to parochial uses. Having fallen into decided dilapidation, it was repaired and put in order in the fifteenth century; but the greater part of the original building is still preserved to us, and is much as it was in Plantagenet days. The interest in the church not only arises from its historical associations, but also from its architectural peculiarity of construction; for, owing to the double purpose which it was intended to serve, it was built with a double nave, parallel to each other and of equal length, though differing somewhat in breadth. The high altar was in line with the parish nave, but a wide opening permitted the nuns to follow the services from their side of the church; and near the east end of the north wall were two hagioscopes, through which the nuns might also view

.

the high altar from the cloister and the refectory. The monuments in the church are both old and interesting. The most ancient is that of Thomas Langton, chaplain (died 1350), who is buried in the choir. Among others of great interest is that of Sir John Crosby, alderman, the founder of Crosby Hall, who died in 1475, and of his wife Ann; an altar tomb, with two recumbent figures, that of Sir Thomas Gresham, the founder of the Royal Exchange (died 1579); an altar tomb, with short inscriptions, that of Sir William Pickering (died 1542), and of his son (died 1547); that of Sir Andrew Judd, lord mayor and founder of the Free Grammar School at Tunbridge (died 1558); that of Sir John Spencer, "rich Spencer," as he was called, and from whom the Marquis of Northampton derives the Spencer portion of his name; and that of Lord Mayor Compton (died 1594). It is also interesting to know that William Shakespeare was in 1598 a member of St. Helen's parish. A window has recently been erected in commemoration of the fact.

The church of St. Mary-at-Hill, also sometimes spoken of as an extant Plantagenet foundation, while it was not completely destroyed in the great fire of 1666, yet was so much damaged that the repairs, executed under Sir Christopher Wren in 1670, or thereabouts, entirely altered its external appearance; and the extensive internal alterations, executed in 1848-1849, so changed it that it can scarcely be counted, with St.

Helen's, as one of the churches of the Plantagenet period still extant. Such is not the case with St. Giles (Cripplegate), for this ancient church shares honors with St. Helen's, and is much as it was when erected about the middle of the fourteenth century; for the old Norman church, of which Alfune, who subsequently became the first hospitaller of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, was the founder, had fallen into great disrepair, and the present edifice was erected on the site. It is of the late perpendicular period, and has many good details, including a nave, chancel and aisles divided by clustered columns, and a pulpit screen and font, which are the work of Grinling Gibbons. Besides its antiquity, the church is interesting as the last resting-place of John Fox, the martyrologist (died 1587), and of John Milton (died 1674). In 1790, however, the grave of the great poet was disturbed, and a number of "indecent liberties taken with his remains." The present monument, erected in his honor, was put up in 1793, at the expense of Mr. Samuel Whitbread, the founder of the great brewery, who was a profound admirer of Milton. Daniel Defoe, who died in the parish, was formerly supposed to have been buried here, but he lies in Tindall's burying-ground, Bunhill Fields. The registers have been carefully kept, and show, under the date July 27, 1623, that Ben Jonson, the dramatist, was married here to Hester Hopkins on that day.

As has been said, London was conspicuous more

perhaps for the number of its churches than for their beauty. To classify all these churches would be impossible; some might, of course, have been ascribed to various periods, but they were often quite incongruous in their various component parts. Some, like St. Paul's, had vaulted roof, and reared their spires proudly aloft; others had low, flat roofs, supported by long aisles of short columns. The vaulted roof was, in fact, still the exception.

The number of churches was, if not surpassed, almost equalled by that of religious establishments. As we have already seen, the Benedictines had splendid establishments at Westminster and Bermondsey, while the Augustinian Canons were established at St. Bartholomew (Smithfield) and at St. Mary Overies (Southwark). Within the walls, or in the neighborhood of the city, the Dominicans (Blackfriars), the Franciscans (Greyfriars) and the Carmelites (Whitefriars) had imposing foundations, great barrack-like buildings, to be sure, but spacious and orderly; while the Augustinian Friars at Aldgate, and the Carthusians on the Cheap, were also liberally established. Thus it may be seen that the monks and regular canons had sought the more secluded and distant sites, where they could pursue their studies in uninterrupted seclusion, while the friars, and other brethren whose work was among the people, had selected sites in the midst of, or nearer anyway to the turmoil of the city's life. Other establishments now arose, and the next

of the great religious orders to seek a footing in London was the illustrious Order of Citeaux. The Cistercians made their appearance in England about 1349, at the time of the great pestilence. Edward III. granted them land to the east of East Smithfield, beyond Tower Hill, where they erected the far-famed abbey of St. Mary of the Graces. To distinguish it from Westminster, which was beyond London on the west side, it was termed East Minster, and continued to be known as such until the dissolution of the religious houses under Henry VIII. caused it to pass into that historical oblivion which, from that time, enveloped so many great ecclesiastical establishments. The great pestilence was also instrumental in creating a demand for another foundation, and in 1371, through the munificence of one Sir Walter de Manny, K. G., the Carthusians were established beyond Aldersgate, somewhat to the northeast of Smithfield and to the southeast of Clerkenwell, and the new priory, which was erected in the midst of a pesthouse field, that the Carthusians might the more promptly attend both the dying and the dead, came to be known as the House of the Salutation of the Venerable Mother of God. Indeed, the suburbs were quite as crowded with religious establishments as the city itself. It may be said that Middlesex was then enjoying what may be termed the period of convents and cloisters, which was later to give way to that of parks and palaces. The religious houses were, how-

ever, a great benefit to the community. They were splendid examples of order and discipline, and seats of learning and wisdom; and besides their political and economic value, their æsthetic value must also be considered great. They were better examples of architecture than then usually existed, and their gardens were indeed things of peace and beauty. Contemporaneous historians are, in fact, rapturous over these gardens, with their beautiful shaded walks, at the corners of which religious shrines inspired even the most sensuous with pious awe.

As we have already seen, the ecclesiastical establishments were by no means confined to the purely monastic foundations, for those military monks, the Knights of St. John and the Knights Templar, had very splendid foundations at Clerkenwell and near the Fleet. The last mentioned was, in fact, as it proved, altogether too splendid for their own welfare. Indeed, the wealth and arrogance of the order throughout Europe aroused considerable envy and jealousy, and led finally to its dissolution by Pope Clement V., at the request of Philip le Bel, King of France, whereupon the property of the order in that country was either granted to the Knights of St. John or confiscated to the crown. This example Edward II. was not reluctant to follow, and in 1313 the order was formally abolished in England. On the downfall of the Templars, the Temple itself was bestowed by Edward II. on Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke.

Following the French precedent, the property, on the death of the Earl of Pembroke, passed into the hands of the Knights of St. John, by whom the Inner and Middle Temples were leased to the students of the Common Law, and the Outer Temple to Walter Stapleton, Bishop of Exeter and Lord Treasurer, who was beheaded in 1326 ; nor did the dissolution of the religious houses under Henry VIII. alter this arrangement, at least as regards the Inner and Middle Temple, for the students of the two Inns of Court remained tenants of the crown until 1608, in which year James I. conferred, by letters patent, both the Inner and Middle Temple on the benchers of the two societies and their successors forever.

While the Inner Temple suffered considerably in the great fire of 1666, the Middle Temple escaped almost uninjured. The great hall of the Middle Temple is still in a great measure, therefore, what it was in the days of its construction (1572), while Plowden, the well-known jurist, was treasurer of the society, and it is one of the finest specimens of Elizabethan architecture that we possess. In the furthest end is the original of Vandyke's portrait of Charles I., of which copies are to be found at Windsor and at Hampton Court. The Middle Temple also possesses a splendid library. The present library is, however, quite modern, and was opened by the Prince of Wales in 1861. The hall of the Inner Temple is, for the same reason, devoid of historic interest, for

Middle Temple, Hall

the old hall, which had been restored in 1816, being found inadequate, the present one was erected in 1869 from designs of Mr. Sydney Smirke, R. A. The gates of both Temples in Fleet Street are of older, though of comparatively recent, origin. That of the Inner Temple dates from the time of James I. The gate house bears the feathers of Henry, Prince of Wales, son of James I., in relief upon the front, and bears also the misleading and entirely erroneous inscription, "formerly the palace of Henry VIII. and Cardinal Wolsey," neither of whom had ever any personal connection with the place. That of the Middle Temple was erected in 1684. It has a heavy, red brick front and stone dressings, and was built, after designs of Sir Christopher Wren, in place of the old gate house, which was celebrated because of its having been the residence of Sir Amias Paulet while Wolsey's prisoner at the Temple.

Among the most eminent members of the Inner Temple Society have been Sir Edward Coke, Sir Christopher Hatton, Lord Backhurst, John Bradford, John Selden, Heneage Finch, Geoffreys Francis Beaumont, Lord Mansfield and William Cowper; while the Middle Temple can boast of having had no less distinguished members in Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Thomas Overbury, Sir John Davies, John Ford, John Pym, Lord Chancellor Clarendon, Bulstrode Whitelocke, Ireton, Evelyn, John Aubrey, Lord Keeper Guildford, Lord Chancellor Somers, Wycher-

ley, Shadwell, Congreve, Elias Ashmole, Southerne, Edmund Burke, Sheridan, Sir William Blackstone, Lord Ashburton, Lord Chancellor Eldon, Lord Stowell, Thomas Moore, Sir Henry Havelock and other celebrities.

But the Inner and Middle Temple Societies did not long remain the only associations of the kind. It will be remembered that when Gilbert de Fraxineto and his thirteen Dominican brethren arrived in England, they had been assigned by Henry III. a piece of ground "without the wall of the city by Oldbourne" (Holborn), and there erected a priory. In 1276 they removed to the precinct which had been set aside for their use in the ward of Castle Baynard by Gregory de Rokesle, then mayor. Then it was that their Holborn property passed into the possession of the De Lacies, Earls of Lincoln. Henry de Laci died in 1312, without male issue, and it has been supposed that it was on his death that the property passed into the possession of the benchers of Lincoln's Inn. This, however, appears not to have been the case, as investigation has shown that the property had passed into their hands before the demise of the last of the De Lacies. It has to this day, however, retained the name, which it had acquired in their day, of Lincoln's Inn. The buildings comprise, besides the entrance gate house in Chancery Lane, the old and new halls, the library, an especially fine modern edifice, and the chapel. The gate house, which is of brick, and which

faces Chancery Lane, and is the oldest of the existing buildings, was built by Sir Thomas Lovell, K. G., son of the executor of Henry VII., and bears on it the date of 1518. The chambers are divided into groups of buildings named respectively, Stone Buildings, Old Square, New Square and New Chambers. The Inn has been fortunate also in the number of great men associated with it, who have included Judge Fortescue, Sir Thomas More, Lord Keeper Egerton, Dr. Donne, Attorney General Noy, Sir Henry Spelman, Colonel Hutchinson, Prynne, Sir Matthew Hale, Sir John Denham, George Wither, Rushworth, John Asgill, Lord Shaftesbury, Horace Walpole, David Garrick, William Pitt, Lord Erskine, Lord Sidmouth, Mr. Canning, Lord Lyndhurst, Brougham, Cottenham and Campbell, Sir E. Sugden, John Galt, Connop Thirlwall and others. Cromwell is said to have been a member of this Inn.

The fourth Inn of Court—that is, Gray's Inn—originated, it is maintained, in the reign of Edward III., and William Skepworth, who was the first reader at Gray's Inn, was the Justice of the Common Pleas during the reign of that monarch. The manor of Portpoole, including "four messuages, an equal number of gardens, the site of a windmill, eight acres of land, ten shillings of rent, and the advowson of the chantry of Portpoole," were sold in 1505 by Edmund Lord Grey de Wilton to a certain Hugh Denny, Esq., his heirs and assigns. From the latter's hands the

manor passed into those of the prior and the priory of East Sheen, Surrey, by whom it was leased to "certain students of the law." The lease was renewed by Henry VIII., when, at the dissolution of the religious houses, the property passed into the possession of the crown. The present hall was erected in 1555-1560. The library and steward's offices were built in 1738, enlarged and remodelled in 1841. A new library was erected in 1883. While originally divided into four courts, Coney Court, Holborn Court, Field Court, between Fulwoods rents and the walks, and Chapel Court, it now comprises only Field Court, Gray's Inn Square and South Square, between which are the hall, chapel, library and steward's offices, and Gray's Inn Walk, with Raymond's Buildings on the west, and Verulam Buildings on the east, overlooking Gray's Inn Road. The old gateway was repaired and thus much disfigured in 1867. Formerly of red brick, it was stuccoed over, and otherwise ornamented. Among the most famous of the members of Gray's Inn who had chambers there have been Lord Chief Justice Gascoigne, Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex; Edward Hall, George Gascoigne, Lord Burghley, Nicholas Bacon, his son Francis, Bancroft, Juxon, Laud, Sheldon, Whitgift, Henry Cromwell, Bradshaw, Lord Chief Justice Holt, Dr. Richard Sibbes, Joseph Ritson, Goldsmith, Macaulay, and others.

Officially, the four inns, or societies, into which the higher legal profession may be said to be divided, are

considered equal in all respects, privileges and precedence; and royalty makes it a point to be always represented in each society, the present royal family being distributed among them as follows: King Edward VII. is a bencher of the Middle Temple; the late Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha was associated with the Inner Temple, and his place has been taken, as it were, by Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein, while the Duke of Cornwall and York and the Duke of Cambridge are connected with Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn respectively.

These legal associations are called Inns of Court from the fact that they were originally connected with the "Aula Regia," or court of the king's palace. Their government is vested in so-called benchers, which body includes the most distinguished members of the English bar, and comprises some six thousand barristers. It is the Inns of Court who have the exclusive right of admitting persons to practice as barristers, and that dignity can only be obtained by the applicant keeping the requisite number of terms as a student at one of the Inns. Only members and students who have actually been admitted can enjoy the privileges of the library and chapel, but in recent times, and occasionally even in the past, it has not been unusual to rent sets of vacant chambers to outsiders, the steward of each inn being charged with such arrangements; and it often therefore occurs that general solicitors, not entitled to the dignity, practice or priv-

ileges of the barristerial body, are found established in chambers within the sacred precincts of the Inns of Court; while in our days even independent literary men, brokers and actors have, in some instances, invaded the barristerial domain, and enjoyed the delightful privilege of chambers in the distinguished legal sanctum.

Each Inn of Court had certain so-called Inns of Chancery attached to or dependent upon it. Thus to the Middle Temple were attached two Inns of Chancery—New Inn and Strand Inn; to the Inner Temple three Inns of Chancery—Clifford's Inn, Clement's Inn and Lyons' Inn (now demolished); to Lincoln's Inn two Inns of Chancery—Furnival's Inn and Thavies' Inn; and to Gray's Inn two Inns of Chancery—Staple Inn and Barnard's Inn. In modern times these have lost much, however, of their distinctive character, and are also largely invaded by outsiders. Each of the Inns of Court had spacious grounds attached. The gardens of the Middle, and especially that of the Inner Temple, however, are the most ornate and beautiful; and here on occasions the illustrious legal society entertains its friends and general society at its now renowned garden parties. The garden of Gray's Inn, called Gray's Inn Walks, owe perhaps much of their celebrity to the writings of Charles Lamb.

Meanwhile the city itself had experienced many improvements and alterations for the better. It had,

residence in Upper Thames Street, and Sir John Philpot, also lord mayor, at his residence in Philpot Lane, Fenchurch Street, had the honor of being on several occasions the host of the court and the prelacy.

Of these residences nothing but the memory remains. Carlisle House, the palace of the Bishops of Rochester, was granted in 1540 by Henry VIII. to Robert Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle, from whom it derived the name by which it was afterwards known. Sold by the Long Parliament for a mere pittance, it was restored to the Bishop of Carlisle at the Restoration, but was never again used as an episcopal residence by the incumbent of that See, and fell into neglect. In the grounds a pottery was established, and the house itself was converted into a tavern, a dancing academy, and a place of low entertainment. It was afterwards a boarding school, and finally, in 1827, was pulled down, and the grounds cut up into building lots. Durham House has met with the same fate. Granted by Henry VIII. to the Earl of Wiltshire, it was restored to the Bishop of Durham by Queen Mary, again granted away by Elizabeth, this time to Sir Henry Sidney, and later to Sir Walter Raleigh, restored again to the Bishop of Durham by James I.; but, in 1623, when preparations were being made for the accommodation of the suite of the Infanta, who was expected in England, as the bride of Prince Charles, Durham House was assigned to them

conjure with equally in the nursery, the library and the lecture hall. Though much in the nature of fairy tale now adorns the accounts which are most usual of this interesting figure in London history, yet a great deal that was formerly discredited has been, in the light of recent research, found to be not only admissible, but perfectly true. His story has been thoroughly investigated, and has been largely used by certain recent writers, who have thrown into their sketches of his singular career a vigor and vitality which have given life to the old story. The facts appear to have been these: Richard Whytyngton was born of a good family in Gloucestershire towards the middle of the fourteenth century. He was the son of Sir William de Whytyngton, lord of the manor of Pauntley, in Gloucestershire, and who died in 1360. Richard, being a younger son, was expected to seek his living. According to the oft-told tale, he determined to seek the metropolis of the kingdom, and there make a fight. Being too poor to ride, he walked to London, and there was apprenticed to a wealthy mercer, a certain John Fitz-Warren, who came also from the western country. This was probably in 1371-1372, during the reign of Edward III. The boy, however, had a wayward nature, and, feeling the irksome burden of forced labor, he ran away, and was about to leave the city when he was arrested by the sound of the bells of St. Mary le Bow as he sat at the foot of Highgate Hill. They seemed to him to

summon him back to his work, and so strongly did this impress him that, rising, he retraced his steps, and resumed his place in the mercer's establishment. Thereafter he stuck to business, and with such assiduity that he rose steadily in the esteem of his employer, and in due time was made free of the Mercers' Company, which numbered Richard II. among its members. The king was not long in noticing Whytyngton. In 1379, when a general subscription was raised for the defence of the city, Whytyngton subscribed five marks to the fund. Ten years later we find him putting his name down for ten pounds instead, and we may thereby judge of the increased prosperity of his affairs. In 1396, Adam Bamme having died while occupying the mayoralty, the king took upon himself to fill the vacancy by appointing Whytyngton to the civic chair—an arbitrary measure which only Whytyngton's popularity rendered palatable to the citizens. That he showed himself worthy in every way of the king's confidence and the people's trust is shown by the fact that he was duly elected the following year to fill the same position. The next year, however, Whytyngton was not elected, for that year Drew Baryntyn was mayor of London. Baryntyn was followed by one Thomas Knollys, who held the mayoralty when Henry IV., the first of the Lancastrian princes, ascended the throne. Meanwhile Whytyngton had married Alice Fitz-Warren, his master's daughter, and had acquired a splendid for-

tune. Always alert in the affairs of the city, he was one of those most keenly interested in the erection of the new Guildhall.

It was long maintained that the old edifice in which, from time immemorial, the city's senate had held its councils was in the Aldermanbury, a street in Cripplegate Ward, and that the new one almost adjoined it, facing merely in another direction. This has, however, in the light of recent investigation been proved to be incorrect. The explanation of the mistake seems to lie in the assumption that there was formerly an entrance in Aldermanbury, which led up a passage into the building. The presumption now seems to be, therefore, that the crypt and the chapel belonged to the older edifice, and had been mercifully spared from the ravages of the fire which destroyed the rest of the building. There seems to be every reason to conclude, therefore, that if the two buildings do not absolutely correspond in the site of their erection, yet they must have occupied very nearly the same area, or areas very closely contiguous. The chapel is held to have been built as early as the days of Edward II., and there are grounds for the belief that the crypt is even older; and though there is no record of the opening or first use of the new building, it need not follow, by the above, that the new edifice was as yet completed in the days of Whytyngton. There is authority, in fact, for the belief that a smaller and temporary structure was erected first on the site

of the new hall, to answer the urgent necessity created by the destruction of the old building, and meet the requirements until plans could be discussed and funds obtained for the erection of the new edifice. These funds were raised by several unusual expedients. First, a small payment was levied on every apprentice, and upon the registry of all deeds, and fines were also imposed on those petty offenders who would, at other times, have paid the penalty of their misdemeanors in the stocks of the Poultry market or the pillory in the Cheap. Secondly, the tolls of London Bridge were made to yield up one hundred pounds of their annual total for six years, which sum was to be used for repairs. It is probable, however, that the plans and other arrangements concerning the exact extent of the site required for the new Guildhall were made prior to the wardenship of Sir Ralph de Sandwich, under whose administration the final adjustment of the city wards was accomplished, for the site of the new hall was a sort of reservation from the ward of Bassishaw added to that of Cheap.

As the building of the hall progressed, private generosity became manifest in the large donations which poured in on all sides. To Whytyngton's generosity—fulfilled, it is true, in a large measure, by his executors—did the new hall owe its fine pavement of Purbeck stone, while aldermen and others contributed largely to the glazing and heraldic splendor of the windows. The niches in the grand porchway

were filled by statues given at different times, and the splendid kitchens were added in 1501. The building itself is described as being two stories in height. The chief feature is said to have been the large arched entrance, on either side of which were columns enriched by spandrels, with escutcheons containing the armorial bearings of Edward the Confessor and those of England. Two ornamental niches containing figures were on either side, while two other niches, also with figures, adorned the upper story. The figures on the lower tier represented Religion, Fortitude, Justice and Temperance; those on the upper tier Law and Learning. Of this building, however, only the crypt and the actual walls remain, so frequent have been the repairs and alterations. The Guildhall suffered severely in the great fire of 1666, but almost immediately work started on the reconstruction, which included a completely new front on King Street. More repairs and alterations were executed in 1706 and 1789, this time on a scale so extensive as to mean the almost complete reconstruction of the entire building. These last alterations were accomplished under the direction of George Dance the younger, who was at that time the city's architect.

The crypt, which is both spacious and vaulted, is situated beneath the great hall. This last apartment, one of the finest in the world, is one hundred and fifty-two feet long, forty-nine feet wide and eighty-nine feet high to the ridge of the roof. It has eight

great bays, the windows of each end being filled with painted glass representing important events connected with civic history, more particularly those of which the hall itself has been the theatre. And how many great and interesting scenes have these walls witnessed! Splendid banquets, at which foreign royalty or other distinguished visitors have been the guests of honor; important receptions of returning heroes; great civic ceremonies, at which the freedom of the city, that signal honor, has been accorded to some man of note—all these, and other great and similar functions, have here been enacted under the imperturbable gaze of those two great civic giants, Colbrand of Britain and Brandamore of Albion—more frequently, though incorrectly, referred to as Gog and Magog—of which the tradition goes back to the days of the Roman invasion, when it is held that their effigies, carried in battle by the unfortunate Britons, were of the greatest help in their efforts at defence. Be that as it may, it is a historical fact that Colbrand and Brandamore seem to have figured as guardians of the city in civic pageants from the earliest times; and it is related that on the entrance of Henry V. into London, on either side of the gateway of London Bridge a great wooden giant, presumably the likeness of the renowned Colbrand, and his contemporary Brandamore, guarded the entrance to the city. Discarded some years since by the committeemen of lord mayor's processions as scarcely suitable to the

times, they stand grim and silent, forever gazing at the brilliant scenes enacted under their empty and sightless scrutiny. The present figures were made by one Richard Saunders, and set up in the hall as late as 1708.

The Guildhall was in 1546 the scene of the trial and condemnation of the unfortunate Anne Askew, who was burned at Smithfield on July 16 of that year. In January, 1571, the Earl of Surrey, the poet, was brought before his judges; while on November 13, 1563, occurred the trial of Lady Jane Grey and her husband, Lord Guilford Dudley; on April 17, 1554, that of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton; and in 1606 that of Father Garnet, the learned Jesuit. But perhaps the greatest scene ever enacted beneath its roof was that when Charles I., after his attempt to arrest five members of Parliament in the house, attended a meeting of the Common Council at Guildhall, and claimed the assistance of the civic officials to seek them out, if they took refuge in the city. The great hall was in 1866–1870 thoroughly repaired, under Sir Horace Jones, the city's architect. Here, on the evening of the ninth of every November, is held the annual banquet of the newly-elected lord mayor, a function of great magnificence, which is always attended by the ministers of the crown. Besides the architectural beauties of the hall and the beautiful windows, the principal objects meriting notice are the monuments of Lord Chatham, with

inscription by Edmund Burke; of William Pitt, with inscription by George Canning; of Lord Nelson, with inscription by R. B. Sheridan; of the Duke of Wellington and of Lord Mayor Beckford, on the pedestal of which is inscribed the mayor's famous address to George III. Busts of Lord Beaconsfield and of Mr. Gladstone were placed here in 1882.

A new Council Chamber, the foundation stone of which was laid on April 30, 1883, was used for the first time for a sitting of the court on October 2, 1884. This apartment, which is to the north of the great hall, and which is reached by a passageway, adorned with busts of Derby, Palmerston and Canning, is duodecagonal in design. It is fifty-four feet in diameter, and is surrounded by a corridor nine feet in width, above which is a gallery for the accommodation of the representatives of the press and the general public. The height from the floor to the top of the dome is sixty-one feet and six inches, and above this again rises the oak lantern to the height of eighty-one feet and six inches. The art gallery, which occupies two rooms on the first floor, was opened in 1886. It contains paintings by Reynolds, Copley, Hoppner, Opie, Lawrence, Smirke and other well-known artists, and busts of Nelson, Wellington, Brougham, Granville, Canning, Clarkson, Havelock, Cobden, Gladstone and Beaconsfield. The rooms in which the library and museum of the Guildhall had been situated having become inadequate, a new library

was erected on the site, immediately to the right of the Guildhall and extending to Basinghall Street. The site was granted in 1870, and the building itself, which was designed by Sir Horace Jones, the city's architect, was formally opened on November 5, 1872. It is a fine stone structure, perpendicular in style, so as to harmonize with the Guildhall itself. The library, which occupies the upper floors, contains about sixty thousand volumes. This includes records of pageants and plays connected with civic festivities, and a very valuable collection of engravings, carefully arranged and classified, of the history, architecture and topography of London and its vicinity, the whole forming an exceedingly important library of reference for the city's historian. In the so-called muniment-room are the city's archives, which extend in almost unbroken line from the first charter granted to the city by William of Normandy down to the present day. The museum occupies the basement floor. It comprises a vast collection of London archaeological and antiquarian curiosities, a large number of Roman remains, including the great find discovered in excavating the foundations of the Royal Exchange, and those disclosed by the digging necessary to the erection of other public edifices, within and without the boundaries of the city. These comprise the group of Deæ Matres found at Crutched Friars, a hexagonal funeral column from Ludgate Hill, the statue of a Roman warrior, and a number of archaeological curios-

ities found in a bastion of the old Roman wall at Bishopsgate; a piece of Roman tessellated pavement from Buclesbury, unearthed in 1869; a fourth century sarcophagus, and a large number of other antiquarian curiosities; lamps, terra-cotta utensils, vases, dishes, drinking goblets, spoons, bowls and other miscellany; also a large collection of mediæval objects, including pilgrims' staffs and tokens, the Beaufoy collection of tavern and tradesmen's tokens, and signboards, perhaps the most interesting of which is that of the Boar's Head Tavern, in East Cheap, where Prince Henry and Sir John Falstaff indulged in their tremendous revels.

Immediately adjacent to the Guildhall was the Bakewellehall, so called from the family of Banquelles, who succeeded the Cliffords and the Basings as civic magnates of the neighborhood. This hall was appropriated in the days of Whytyngton as a mart for the sale of broadcloth. Both the chapel and the Bakewellehall have, however, long since disappeared, and have yielded their places to the Bankruptcy Court and other civic buildings.

Whytyngton's second, or, to be more correct, his third term of office was in 1406, and his return to the mayoralty was marked by a return of that dread scourge, the plague, of which reports show that more than thirty thousand victims perished. The unpopularity of the king, the constant riots, the frequent executions for high treason, the oft-recurring burning

of heretics, under the act for the suppression of the Lollards—all these, added to the horrors of the fearful and fatal scourge, must have rendered the year one of dreadful anxiety and distress.

With the accession of Henry V. the tumult seemed to increase, instead of diminish, and learning and scholarship were seriously threatened thereby. In the midst of such excitements men had no time to think or study. In 1413 we find Henry V. sending a mandate to the lord mayor, charging him to see that the aldermen all reside within the city. The year following, the Lollards, as the followers of the Wycliffian heresies were called, succeeded under Sir John Oldcastle in organizing themselves, and in January, 1414, a riot incited by them was with difficulty repressed. Sir John Oldcastle himself was subsequently overtaken in his native Monmouthshire, and suffered the penalty of his treason to Church and State. But amid all this chaos, if men did not find leisure for the polite arts, they at least found time to increase their fortunes. Whytyngton was among the most successful of speculators in his enterprises, and accumulated vast wealth, which, however, he dispensed with generosity and liberality. Wonderful tales are told of his lavishness, and it is related that when the king returned, in 1415, from the triumphs of Agincourt, Whytyngton went to Westminster to greet him, and there before him burned bonds worth £60,000 as an offering to his royal master, thus releasing

him from a pressing obligation. It has been hinted, however, that it is more than probable that he had made quite as much, if not more, in loaning money to the king on previous occasions, and that, in the precarious condition of the royal exchequer, the burned bonds were not worth their nominal value. The same year had seen the then lord mayor, Nicholas Watton, proceed in full civic state through London to Westminster, to render thanks on the great victory, as soon as the news was learned.

In 1419, in which year the king espoused the Princess Katherine, daughter of Charles VI., king of France, Whytyngton was lord mayor for the fourth and last time, and though his term of office expired on January 1, 1420, yet, in consideration of his really great services to the city, the king and queen, on their return to London, the following February, honored him by becoming his guests at a great banquet given by him in their honor. This was indeed the culmination of his ambitions. To have attained such social distinction and fortune must have seemed almost a dream to the once-while apprentice. He survived his final triumphs but three years, however, and died in 1423. His life had been one full of energy and hard work, but by no means devoid of romance. For the country lad, coming to London for the first time, it must have seemed to him a wonderful place. He must have witnessed many interesting and historic spectacles.

It is probable that he was present at the last tournament of Richard II., and had seen Alice Perrers riding through the Cheap as the Lady of the Sun; occupying the same balcony that Philippa had occupied before she was supplanted in the king's affections. Often must he have looked upon the gay banners hung out from houses in which some eminent guest was then residing, or indicating the presence in the mansion of some baron attending Parliament. It is more than likely that he witnessed also the great mystery play, the world's history, which lasted eight days, and was given by the parish clerks at Skinner's Well, near Clerkenwell, where nobles and other great people assembled to behold it. But his experiences cannot all have been of this nature, and he must have twice witnessed the horrible sights of the pest field, and seen the bodies of some fifty thousand victims during the two epidemics pass before him.

His benefactions did not end with his life, and the munificent gifts which he had made to the city during his life were continued by his orders after his decease. Among other institutions which owe their foundations to his benevolence, St. Michael's Seminary (Paternoster Royal) enjoys possibly the first place, but he showed also his great interest in aid of scholarship by his gift of a library to the Franciscans and to the Guildhall. To him is also attributed the foundation of the first public library, and it would appear that to receive the books thus donated a large and commodi-

ous building was erected closely adjoining the chapel of Guildhall. During the reign of Edward VI. the books were, however, removed by the Protector Somerset, and, though he promised to restore them, he never did so; and so London down to our own day was left without a city library. The rebuilding of Newgate Prison, the paving of the Guildhall, the restorations at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and the founding of an almshouse, were among the objects to which he devoted a large portion of his wealth. Thus should Whytyngton's name be associated not only with the romantic interest by which chroniclers have surrounded him, but also with the material benefits for which his fellow-citizens should hold him in everlasting gratitude.

If Whytyngton deserves our praise for his admirable administration of the city's interests and his benevolence, Carpenter, his executor, also deserves the gratitude of the historian because of his laborious compilation, the famous "Liber Albus," or "White Book," a collection of London records made while he was secretary of the city in 1417. If to Whytyngton London owes the foundation of its public library, it was Carpenter who was the founder of the first city school. Like Sir Thomas More, he belonged to the lay brotherhood of the Charterhouse, and seems to have been also associated with other confraternities of an ecclesiastical character.

It was in 1416, during the reign of Henry V. and

the mayoralty of Sir Henry Barton, that the lighting of London streets by lamps was made obligatory, and it was in 1422, in which year William Waldern was lord mayor, that a weather-cock was first affixed to the spire of St. Paul's. Nor was this a matter of light moment, since record is made of it. The same year saw the premature death of Henry V. and the accession of his infant son, who entered London in solemn procession Wednesday, November 17, 1423. That day St. Paul's was the scene of a strange, impressive ceremony, for the infant king was led to the high altar and there made to kneel, while the court stood around him and looked down at the small, frightened figure of the child. The poor child, who naturally wondered much at all that was going on about him, looked grave and sad, as if foreseeing the dread calamities with which his reign was to be fraught. Indeed, hardly was the ceremony over than the streets of London were once more the scene of riots and affrays, the members of the rival factions of Lancaster and York giving each other frequent battle. Nor could the city remain neutral in the royal warfare, for it was itself in frequent danger of being seized by either one party or the other. Thus, in 1426, Sir John Coventry, then holding the mayoralty, was warned of a conspiracy to seize the city, which design had originated with and was to be carried out under the order of Henry, Cardinal Beaufort, then Bishop of Winchester, who was Gloucester's

strongest rival. He at once ordered the gates locked and the shops closed, and called out what armed force the city had at its disposal. By taking such effective measures the plan failed, but such events were of frequent occurrence during the forty years of Henry VI.'s reign.

No monarch, perhaps, who ever sat on the British throne had so difficult a role as that which Providence had assigned to Henry VI. To the extremely unsettled condition of affairs in England was added the difficulties which confronted him in France, and to which his father, by his ambitions, had committed him. To maintain his claim to the French crown with any show of success taxed the king's resources and his supply of men to the utmost. Charles VII., the rightful king of France, then at Orleans, living a life of ease and luxury with the beautiful Agnes Sorel, was recognized as the rightful monarch of the realm by the southern and eastern provinces, but had not the energy to exert himself sufficiently to eject the English from the country. This energy remained to be borne in the bosom of "*Voyeuse de Domremi*," that fair maid whom history reveres as its greatest heroine under the name of Joan of Arc. The events with which her name is connected need scarcely be described. All know how, on the 29th of April, 1429, she succeeded at the head of ten thousand troops in defeating the British under the Earl of Suffolk at Orleans, and, raising the siege, entered the

town with supplies ; how, in June, she defeated Talbot at Patay, and how, in July of the same year, Charles VII. finally entered Rheims in triumph and was crowned in that city's famous cathedral. The cause of Henry VI. was still upheld in Paris, and the following year he was crowned in that city with great solemnity, but hastened almost immediately to England.

In London, through which he passed on his way to Westminster, he was received with much ceremony, and conducted through the city by the mayor and citizens. A few years later another and even more solemn procession passed through the city ; for, in January, 1437, the body of the queen mother, widow of Henry V., rested in St. Paul's on its way from Bermondsey Abbey, where she breathed her last, to Westminster, where she was buried. While her remains were thus being transported in solemn convoy to their last resting-place, her second husband, Owen Tudor—he who became the father of the future king of England—was, strange enough, lying in Newgate Prison, in the immediate vicinity. The same year saw another great funeral pageant traverse the city—this time that of Joanna of Navarre, widow of Henry VI. She had been accused of sorcery during her step-son's reign, but it has been suggested that in all probability her crime was that of abetting and sympathizing with the Lollards. Such accusations were quite common in those days, it would appear ; nor

did the highest station act as a protection. In the case of Eleanor Cobham, second wife of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the condemned woman performed a pilgrimage through the streets of London, the like of which has seldom been equalled and never surpassed. According to the usually accepted story, she was sent from Westminster by water, and walked, with only a "keverchef" on her head, through Fleet Street to St. Paul's, where she made an offering of a two pound wax taper. This took place on a certain Monday, the thirteenth day of November. On the following Wednesday, November the fifteenth, she made what was known as her "dismal" walk from the Swan, in Thames Street, through Bridge Street and Gracechurch Street, to Leadenhall, and so on to the church of St. Katherine Cree, near Aldgate. At each place she was met by the mayor, in full civic robes, the sheriffs and delegations from the craftguilds, who accompanied her on her pilgrimage and witnessed her submission. It seems, however, to have availed her nothing; for she was subsequently condemned to perpetual imprisonment, for which was substituted exile to the Isle of Man. Her husband, whose memory has been handed down to us as the "good Duke Godfrey," was not allowed to long survive her disgrace, for he was foully murdered at Bury St. Edmunds, and was promptly followed into a better world by his half-uncle Henry, Cardinal Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester.

But though these were dead, rivalries still continued, and the city was rent with strife and constant quarreling. In the years immediately following, the city records are extremely meagre, but in 1450 an Irish adventurer named Cade, but who took the name of Mortimer, headed the so-called Kentish insurrection, and, leading his army of twenty thousand men over the Dartford hills to the Thames, he appeared at the city gates and encamped at Blackheath. The king seems to have been terrified and fled to Kenilworth, and the mayor, a certain Thomas Chalton, contented himself with summoning a meeting of the Common Council, at which it was debated whether or not Cade and his followers should be admitted to the city. That Cade was a man of firmness and ability there does not seem reason to doubt. The Archbishop of Canterbury and other great personages had interviews with him, and he evidently had the complete sympathy of the populace. Of all the aldermen at the council which Chalton had summoned, one, Robert Horne, seems to have been the only one to have had courage sufficient to advise resistance; but even had his advice been agreed to, it would have been too late, as the afternoon of the day which had seen the council in the morning witnessed the entry into London of Cade and his men.

Attired in a gorgeous gown of blue velvet, with gilt helmet and spurs, this remarkable man entered the city on horseback, causing a sword to be borne

before him, as if he had been a knight. Coming over London Bridge, he passed along the Watling Street, and proceeded to London Stone, which, striking with his sword, he exclaimed, "Now is Mortimer lord of the city!"

The following day he repaired to Guildhall, and was there deferentially received by the mayor and aldermen assembled. On this occasion Lord Say was arraigned; but when he claimed trial by his peers as his inalienable right, he was dragged into the Cheap, and there beheaded, like a common malefactor, and in company with a murderer named Hawarden. His body, being stripped, was afterwards dragged through the streets, leaving bloody traces in its wake. Horne was summoned to trial at the same time for having advised resistance to Cade and his army, but escaped on payment of five hundred marks. Crouner, Say's brother-in-law, shared his fate, and being delivered at Mile End to a party of rebels, their heads were borne on poles through the city and set up on London Bridge. The iniquities consummated, Cade dined at the house of a merchant, taking with him what plate and valuables he could lay his hands on.

This state of things could naturally not last long. Lord Scales, who commanded the garrison at the Tower, having been solicited by the mayor and aldermen to act in concert with them in repressing the robbers, came to an understanding with the civic officials. The following day (Sunday) and all that

London Bridge

night a fierce battle raged on London Bridge between the king's forces and the robbers, and Cade and his men, who had retired to Southwark, on the southern bank of the river, for the night, in the morning found entrance to the city denied him. His efforts to force an entrance were unsuccessful, and he and his followers withdrew to Queensborough, from where they hoped to escape to the continent with their plunder, which he had caused to be forwarded by water to Rochester ahead of him. He was overtaken in Sussex and executed, his head replacing those of Say and Crouner on London Bridge. This closed the incident, one of the most singular in the history of the city.

While the events which follow belong more to the history of the nation than to that of London itself, yet indirectly they had an influence on the city which renders it necessary to give them a passing notice. It will be remembered that while the Lancastrian princes were the representatives in the masculine line of Edward III., being descended from his fourth son, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, the princes of York, if female descent be admitted in this connection, belonged to an elder branch, they being descended from Philippa, Countess of March, only daughter and child of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, third son of Edward III. They were also, of course, descended from Edward III. in the male line—that is, from his fifth son, Edmund, Duke of York—and

as such were the legitimate heirs to the throne in the masculine line, in the case of failure of male heirs in the older masculine and Lancastrian branch. This claim, however, had no standing as long as the Lancastrian line existed, and they therefore, relying on the fact that the Salic law had never received specific recognition in England, based their claim to the throne through their female descent, which gave them a title of seniority over the Lancastrian branch.

The queen's delivery of an infant son on October 13, 1453, removed all hopes of the peaceful succession of the Duke of York on the death of Henry VI. It was the first spark which ignited the torch of the great civil war which raged so fiercely in England for some thirty years. The king, being seriously ill at the time of his son's birth, was incapable of maintaining even the appearance of royalty, and the queen and the royal council, deprived of his support, easily became mere tools in the hands of the Yorkists. These at once sent Somerset to the Tower, and appointed the Duke of York lieutenant of the kingdom, with power to open and to hold a Parliament, on the meeting of which, that assembly, taking into consideration the troubled state of the public affairs, voted him protector of the kingdom during the king's illness. When Henry VI. recovered his health, the following year, he caused the protectorship of the duke to be annulled, and himself nominally resumed the reins of government. He recalled Somerset from

the Tower, and placed the government in his hands. But the Duke of York had now tasted the sweet balm of authority, and calling an army together, on the plea that the king's ministers were imposing on him, and that the whole government needed reform, he opened hostilities in earnest.

The side which London would take in the coming contest it was felt would determine its result. As in the days when Æthelred fought Canute, the possession of the city was recognized as the key of the situation, and such possession the only road to the secure enjoyment of the throne. Up to 1452 the city itself had always been loyal to the Lancasters, and had vigorously upheld the claims of Henry VI. Times had changed, however, and the prestige of the Lancastrian crown had been visibly tarnished by the reverses which had overcome English arms in France. The power of England and English influence had, in fact, practically ceased to exist in that country. The impetus given by the Maid of Orleans had carried everything before it. The French nation awoke like one man to the necessity of repulsing the invader, and of the once vast dominions of the English crown across the channel, nothing remained now but Calais. The possessions lost were lost forever. The king of England could no longer with justice affect the French title.

In approaching London, therefore, the Duke of York felt that the fate which had destroyed the Eng-

lish power on the continent, and thus impaired the prestige of the house of Lancaster, would perhaps now turn in his favor, and give him easy possession of the city. He even hoped that the gates would be promptly opened to him. But finding on his arrival that entrance was denied him, he crossed the Thames at Kingston, and took an advantageous position at Dartford, the king's army being at Blackheath. Though hostilities were for the moment averted, they were only postponed. Civil war had now been kindled and could not be checked, and a clash of arms was bound to come in the near future. This occurred at St. Alban's, in 1455, in which battle the Yorkists were victorious. Somerset was slain, and the king conducted by the Duke of York back to London. Thus the "War of the Roses," as it has been called, from the fact that the badge of the Lancastrians was a red rose and that of the Yorkists a white one, began in earnest. Battle followed battle, each party being victorious, as it were, by turns. To St. Alban's succeeded Bloreheath, and to the latter Ludlow, in which the Lancastrians regained their ascendancy.

In the meanwhile the Earl of Warwick, one of the most ardent supporters of the Duke of York, had seized Calais, which he made a sort of base for military operations. Landing at Sandwich, and himself conducting the young Earl of March, he sent a herald to London to ascertain the sentiments of the city. Unfortunately for the Lancastrians, the finances

were not in the best of shape, and the king's debts grew rapidly to tremendous proportions. Such a condition of affairs affected others than the immediate royal creditors, and, descending down the scale to petty tradesmen and lesser people, affected commerce grievously. The hearts of the people turned, therefore, from those who had the governing of the land, and to whom they attributed their grievances; and when, therefore, the messenger of the Earl of Warwick reached London, he was kindly received, and a deputation of twelve aldermen was dispatched to assure the earl of a welcome; and on July 2, 1460, they entered London. A convocation, which was being held at St. Paul's, was turned suddenly into a political meeting, and Warwick harangued those present on behalf of the young Earl of March, expounding on the misrule of the government. Warwick then made his father, Salisbury, governor of the city, and set forth to meet the royal army at Northampton.

Meanwhile the Londoners grew impatient, and, accepting the leadership of Salisbury, they proceeded to blockade the Tower. At Northampton the Yorkists proved successful, and when the news of the Lancastrian defeat reached the city, and Henry VI. was brought back to London and made a prisoner again in the bishop's palace, Lord Scales, who had command of the Tower, surrendered. Attempting to escape across the Thames, he was unfortunately recog-

nized by a woman just as he was entering a boat. The boat was pursued, and he was captured and killed, his body being thrown on to the Surrey shore, near the Priory of St. Mary Overies. The king, however, was not long detained a prisoner in London, but was sent to his manors at Greenwich and Eltham. Parliament meeting in October, they endeavored to adjust matters by declaring that while the king, as he had for eight and thirty years peaceably enjoyed the crown, it should not be denied him in his old age, they nevertheless recognized the claims of the Duke of York, and declared him to be the rightful heir to the crown on the king's decease, thus setting aside the claims of the king's son. Thus it was hoped that peace would at least be temporarily restored.

The queen, who after the defeat of Northampton had fled to Durham with her infant son, declined, however, to submit to any arrangement which should debar her offspring from what she held to be his legitimate and inalienable right. She succeeded in engaging the sympathies of the northern barons, and in collecting, with their assistance, an army of twenty thousand strong. The Duke of York being apprised of this, hastened to the north, hoping, with five thousand men that he had with him, to suppress what he held to be at first only an incipient insurrection. The battle of Wakefield followed, in which, being quite outnumbered by the queen's men, the Yorkists were completely routed, the Duke of York being killed in

the fight, and a few days afterward the Earl of Salisbury being beheaded at Pontefract. The queen now divided her army, and sent a small division of it to the aid of Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke, the king's half-brother, who was endeavoring at the time to raise forces in Wales against Edward, the new Duke of York. She then marched with the larger division towards London, which had been left by the Yorkists in the command of the Earl of Warwick. The Londoners hearing of her approach, and dreading lest she intended to compensate her northern followers by permitting a sack of the city, dispatched envoys to her, begging for her favor; but meanwhile they closed the gates of the city to some of her retinue and the men at arms which she had sent on ahead of her. The young Duke of York had meanwhile proceeded to the west to engage Pembroke and his men. In the battle of Mortimer's Cross which followed he gained, in February, 1461, a complete victory, and while Pembroke escaped, his father, Owen Tudor, was taken prisoner and immediately beheaded.

The queen meanwhile was still advancing on London. The Earl of Warwick, who had gone forth from the city to prevent her advance, met her at St. Alban's. The armies came together, and a battle ensued which gave the victory to the queen. It did not avail her much, however, as the Duke of York advanced on London from the other side, and, collecting the remnants of Warwick's army, was, with his com-

bined forces, in a position to give her battle. Realizing the probabilities of defeat, she retired to the north; while the Duke of York, proceeding towards London, entered the capital on February 28, 1461, amid the acclamations of the fickle populace. He at once summoned a council of lords, and invited the people of the city to Smithfield, the Cheap being no longer possible for a "folkmote," to express their will. There, in St. John's fields, near Clerkenwell, Henry VI. was publicly declared to have forfeited the crown, and Edward proclaimed king as Edward IV. The next day he made a solemn progress through the city, and was crowned at Westminster; but he had very little time for peace or repose, for the queen had in the meanwhile succeeded in collecting an army of sixty thousand men in Yorkshire. The Earl of Warwick, however, with forty-nine thousand men, was sent to meet her, and Edward followed him. The two armies met at Towton, near York. The Lancastrians were defeated, and the victory remained with the Yorkists. The queen now made her famous journey to France to induce Louis XI. to aid her cause, and the latter finally acceded to her wishes, granting her a small body of men if she, in return, would promise Calais in the event of her success. Luck seemed against her, for she was defeated at Hedgeley Moor, in Northumbria, this being on April 25, 1464, and afterwards again, at Hexham, on May 15 of the same year. The Duke of Somerset and the Lords Ross and

Hungerford were pursued and captured, and immediately beheaded. The king, however, managed to remain concealed in Lancashire until July of the following year, when, his place of concealment being disclosed to Edward IV., he was taken prisoner and conveyed to the Tower.

In the meantime Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Wydeville had estranged from him Warwick and the other followers, who became impatient of the sudden rise of the Wydevilles. The now discontented Warwick, with the aid of Edward's younger brother, the Duke of Clarence, who had also turned against him, dragged the unfortunate king once more from his confinement. A treaty was made between Louis XI. and the Warwick-Clarence party, whereby, in the case of their being successful in re-establishing Henry's authority, the real power should be vested in the hands of Warwick, and Clarence should, on the king's death, inherit the crown. An army having been assembled, Warwick landed at Dartmouth on September 3, 1470, with the Duke of Clarence and the Earls of Oxford and Pembroke. Warwick's popularity was immense, and in a few days he had followers to the number of sixty thousand. Hearing of their menaced approach, Edward fled to Lynn, in Norfolk, where he boarded a ship and embarked for the continent.

In less than twenty-four days Warwick was master of the kingdom. He hastened to London, and, liber-

ating the king from his prison, summoned a Parliament in the name of the prince to meet at Westminster. This body solemnly recanted their former errors, and renounced their allegiance to the usurping Edward, declaring Henry to be the rightful sovereign. As his mental incapacity disqualified him for the management of public affairs, Warwick and Clarence were jointly entrusted with the regency. Edward had, in the meanwhile, sought the hospitality of the Duke of Burgundy who, to thwart and annoy his suzerain, Louis XI., listened attentively to Edward's grievances, and loaned him a small squadron and some two thousand men. Landing at Ravenspur, in Yorkshire, on March 14, 1471, he proceeded to York, where he was joined by a number of his adherents. Warwick, on the other hand, on hearing of Edward's landing, assembled an army at Leicester and prepared to meet the forces of the Yorkists; but Edward, taking another road, gave him the go-by; and, reaching London, demanded admittance of the citizens, who, shifting once more their allegiance, opened wide the gates. This placed the unfortunate king in the hands of his enemies, and thus was this unhappy monarch once more conveyed to the Tower and imprisoned.

The meeting between Edward IV. and Warwick was, however, only postponed by this manœuvre, and it finally occurred at Barnet, near London, on April 14, just a month after the landing of Edward from the continent. Meanwhile the unfortunate queen was

travelling with her infant son, Edward, Prince of Wales, through Dorsetshire, Somerset and Gloucestershire, accompanied only by a small body of French troops. At Tewkesbury the royal family were overtaken by Edward and his men, who insulted the queen and her ladies, and turned the unfortunate young prince over to Lord Hastings and Sir Thomas Grey, by whom he was promptly dispatched with their daggers. The miserable queen was conveyed to London and thrown into the Tower, in which fortress her husband, the ill-fated Henry VI., so shortly after met his untimely end. Edward himself now advanced on London. The mayor, afterwards Sir John Stockton, attended by his sheriffs and the aldermen, proceeding in full civic state, went forth to Islington to meet him. Gratified by their submission, Edward knighted them by the roadside. He entered the city in solemn procession. That night Henry VI. was murdered in the Tower. It is said and generally believed that Richard, Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III., did the deed. Shakespeare so portrays it in his tragedy. The next day his body was brought to St. Paul's and exhibited to the people. If there were any one present who could remember that day eight and forty years before, when the infant king was led to the foot of the same altar, such person must have recalled, with a certain degree of wonder, the seemingly prophetic sadness which pervaded the countenance of the young king on that great occasion, as though

the child's mind had had a glimpse of the terrible misfortunes and final tragic end that awaited him. Henry VI. was buried at Chertsey Abbey ; but the body was removed under the reign of Richard III., and, probably as an atonement, buried beside Edward IV. in St. George's Chapel at Windsor Castle. His unfortunate widow, completely overcome with grief, was, by agreement with the king of France, released from her imprisonment and conveyed to France, where she lived in the strictest seclusion until her death, some years later. This was, as it were, the final act of the " War of the Roses."

With the accession of Edward IV. a period of fifteen years of comparative peace settled on the country, and London was not long in experiencing the benefit thereof. After so many years of constant chaos and confusion, strife and struggle, the rule of any monarch whose reign was undisturbed by ever-recurring tumults and riots would naturally be popular. Edward had, besides, a certain popularity himself. He had always remained faithful to the pledges which he had made to the city, and the treaty which he had made with Flanders and the Netherlands was most favorably regarded by the city merchants. In the interval of peace commerce commenced again to look up, and the prospects brightened perceptibly. Edward himself disclosed a mercantile spirit hitherto not displayed by kings. He himself engaged in trade and sent and sold wool in Flanders.

But kingship, even when combined with commercial pursuits and business interests, did not suffice to keep him occupied, and he seemed to find ample time for the indulgence of his rough convivial spirits. All will remember the short-lived career and tragic end of the unfortunate Jane Shore, once the recipient of the king's favors. After Edward's death she attached herself to Lord Hastings, but their known partiality for the little princes, his sons, rendered them obnoxious to Richard III., and, on the ground of witchcraft, Hastings was beheaded and his so-called accomplice deprived of her house and fortune, and compelled to do public penance. Once more London witnessed the repulsive sight of a woman scantily clad paraded forcibly through the streets to St. Paul's and back, to ask mercy for an imaginary crime, followed the while by the jeers of the multitude. This time the Bishop of London, besides other distinguished persons, lent their countenance to the performance and headed the procession in robes of office. While Eleanor Cobham had been allowed no covering to screen her from public gaze, Jane Shore was permitted a winding sheet as covering. In this she was more fortunate, but she ended even more miserably ; for it is related that all being forbidden to give her alms or food, she perished from hunger and cold in a ditch beyond Bishopsgate, whence the present Shoreditch. This is disputed, however, by antiquaries ; still the tradition remains to this day in the locality.

The death of Edward IV. was the signal for renewed tumult and disturbance, in which the city was perforce obliged to take part. The young prince, Edward V., was at the time of his father's demise residing with his maternal uncle, Anthony Wydeville, Earl Rivers, at the castle of Ludlow, on the borders of Wales. The patron of Caxton, of literature and of the arts, Rivers was by far the most accomplished nobleman of the time. The young prince, then thirteen years of age, had been most carefully brought up and educated. The instant the news reached Rivers that Edward IV. was dead, he and his young charge started for London. Richard, Duke of Gloucester, the king's youngest brother, had determined, however, to possess himself of the crown. He was, after the late king's son, the next in line of succession—Edmund, Earl of Rutland, having been killed at Wakefield, and George, Duke of Clarence, executed for high treason in the Tower in 1478. Gloucester, who had obtained from the late king, on his death-bed, the nomination of regent during the minority of the young king, at once started out from York, accompanied by a numerous train, in advance of the royal party. Meeting Edward V. and his escort at Stony Stratford, he caused Earl Rivers, Sir Richard Grey, one of the queen's sons, and Sir Thomas Vaughan to be arrested and conducted to Pontefract. Possessing himself of the young king's person, he started on a return journey to London. They were

met as they approached by the lord mayor and corporation of the city at Hornsey, and the coronation of the young king was set for two months ahead, the date being fixed at June 22.

If Gloucester had hitherto concealed his designs, he now no longer hesitated to avow them openly, at least to his immediate followers. Having taken the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Hastings into his confidence, he easily obtained their support. His first step was to order Sir Richard Radcliffe, who had the care of Rivers and the other prisoners at Pontefract, to put them to death. Feeling it to be most important to obtain the favor of the city to his plans, Richard's next step was to have Sir Edmund Shaw, who at the time held the mayoralty, sworn of the Privy Council, and he arranged with his brother, Dr. Shaw, one of the foremost ecclesiastics of the age, to preach a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in which he should hold up the late king to ignominy, accuse the queen of adultery, proclaim the illegitimacy of the young princes, the king's sons, and extol Richard's virtues, his wisdom and his courage. At this point in the discourse Richard had planned that he should appear, as if by accident, and he counted that, with the aid of a few preconcerted cheers among his followers, the people would greet him with enthusiasm and proclaim him king. By a circumstance, unfortunate for him, he arrived a little too late. The whole effect was spoiled thereby, and the acclamations were

not forthcoming. Speeches were also made by other strong adherents of the duke, Buckingham and Fitzwilliam, the recorder of the city, but they were of no avail, and the people showed no inclination to set aside the order of succession. In Buckingham's speech he stated that the lords and commons would probably have decided the matter without consulting the opinion of the people, but that they were anxious to have the city with them, and they wished and expected a reply one way or another. Thus was the right of the city to have a voice in the matter of the royal succession tacitly admitted. As silence continued in the assembly, some of the duke's followers raised a shout at the back of the hall, calling for Richard and throwing their caps in the air, and, as there was no voice raised in opposition, Buckingham assumed there was a perfect unanimity of opinion, and invited the mayor and other civic dignitaries to put on their robes of office and to repair with him on the morrow to Castle Baynard, where the duke had his residence, and place the crown at his feet. Richard affected the greatest reluctance to avail himself of the homage and high dignity offered him by the people. He refused at first to admit them, and then pretended to hesitate. Finally he allowed himself to be persuaded into acceptance, and to be taken to Westminster, where he took his place on the throne.

He could not, however, feel secure in his position as long as his young nephews were alive, and his

next step was therefore to give orders to Sir Robert Brakenbury, under whose care they had been placed, to put them to death. This nobleman, to his honor be it said, refused to perform or to lend himself to a duty so infamous and horrible. Sending therefore for Sir James Tyrrel, one of his creatures, the king bade him do the deed, and exacted a promise of Tyrrel of absolute obedience. Brakenbury was then commanded to turn the keys of the Tower over to Tyrrel for one night, which order he reluctantly obeyed. The rest of the sad story is well known to all. How, choosing for his associates two men, Dighton and Forrest by name, Tyrrel approached the princes' chamber that night, and sending the assassins in, bade them accomplish their commission, while he himself remained without. The unfortunate children were in their bed and fast asleep. Having suffocated them with the bolsters and pillows, they showed their naked bodies to Tyrrel, who commanded that they should be buried "deep into the ground, under a heap of stones, at the foot of the stairs." Thus perished the "Princes of the Tower," who are perhaps the most romantic of the personages of English history. Their bones were found in the course of the repairs made during the reign of Charles II., and caused by that monarch to be interred with much pomp at Westminster Abbey.

Richard III. was not long allowed to enjoy in peace the throne which he had obtained at the price

of so much crime and bloodshed. Hardly had he assumed the reins of government before disaffection followed, and that in quarters where he least expected it—among his former most ardent supporters. Buckingham and Morton, Bishop of Ely, came to an understanding whereby Henry, the young Earl of Richmond, was to be placed upon the throne. Henry himself was wisely kept out of harm's way in Brittany until plans could be matured and an army raised to back his claims. Buckingham commenced the campaign by starting an insurrection in Wales, but owing to heavy rains, which had swelled the rivers and made them impassable, his troops became discouraged and deserted. Finding himself thus abandoned, he endeavored to conceal himself in the house of an old family servant, by whom he was betrayed. He was brought before the king at Salisbury, and instantly executed for high treason, November 2, 1483. Meanwhile Richmond had made his preparations, and set sail from St. Malo, with an army of about two thousand men. He was driven back by a storm, however; but, undiscouraged, set sail again, this time from Honfleur, in Normandy, and after a journey of six days landed at Milford Haven, in Wales, on August 7, 1485. From that time fortune seemed to favor the young Earl of Richmond in every way; for when, Richard III. advancing to prevent his progress, the armies met at Bosworth, Henry was joined by Lord Stanley with seven thousand men,

Bloody Tower, Tower of London

1

2

3

4

and completely routed the king's armies, Richard himself losing his life on the field of battle. Six days later Henry entered London in triumph. At no time of her existence did London pass through a period so turbulent and agitated as that which she experienced during the reign of the Lancastrian and Yorkist princes. That such upheavals as those which were the natural outcome of the civil war which was raging throughout those reigns were, if not totally destructive, at least seriously injurious to commerce and business interests, can be readily supposed. It is true that during a short interval of peace which succeeded the accession of Edward IV. commercial prosperity was largely enhanced; and the monarch himself, taking an interest in trade, did, by his royal example, greatly benefit the commercial relations of the nation. Whatever may have been the general apathy, it cannot be said that the city companies were in the meanwhile neglecting their opportunities. Fourteen companies obtained charters of incorporation during this time—one, the Cordwainers, from Henry IV.; six, the Cutlers, the Vintners, the Brewers, the Haberdashers, the Girdlers and the Armorers, from Henry VI.; and seven, the Woolmen, the Ironmongers, the Tallow Chandlers, the Dyers, the Pewterers, the Cloth Workers and the Cooks, from Edward IV.

Literature, the arts and society suffered as much, if not more than commerce. The calendar of great names in literature is a short one, and comprises prin-

cipally the names of Andrew Wyntoun, William Caxton, William Dunbar and John Bale. Caxton owed his success largely to the patronage of Anthony Wydeville, Earl Rivers, that accomplished nobleman to whose talents tribute has already been made. What the consorts of Henry I., Henry III., Edward I. and Edward III. had been to their time, Earl Rivers was to his. Though of a retiring disposition, so great was his genuine love of culture, and so great the charm of his manner and society, that he drew around him the best thought and literary expression of his day. With the exception of the usual tilts and tournaments, there can be said to have been very little of what we to-day would consider social festivity. It is true that the strong-minded and unhappy consort of Henry VI. endeavored to bring about her the more brilliant element of the society of the day, but perhaps circumstances, rather than taste, led her to be surrounded by men of action and of the sword, instead of men of thought and of the pen. The most splendid entertainments were to be found not at court, that usual abode of society, but in the civic world. We have, of course, record of that wonderful entertainment given by Edward V. at Waltham Forest, during the mayoralty of William Heriet (Harcourt), but it was in the nature of a hunt rather than a social festival, and the supper by which it was terminated was in a great measure an orgie. The entertainments of Whytyngton, on the contrary, were not only

more formal, but united the best cooking to the best manners known at that time.

During the reign of Edward IV. Alderman Sir John Crosby gave in his mansion in Bishopsgate Street a series of very handsome entertainments, the fame of which has descended to our own day. Crosby Hall, celebrated as the scene of these festivities, has had a varied history. In 1518 it was held by Sir Thomas More, and here he is said to have written his *Utopia*, and Richard III. In 1523 he sold it to his friend, Antonio Bonvici, who some years later leased it to William Roper, the husband of More's favorite daughter, Margaret. It came in 1560 into the possession of Germaine Cioll, who resided here until 1566, when it was sold to the merchant prince, Alderman William Bond, who died in 1576. After this it seems to have been customary to lodge ambassadors here. The Spanish and Danish ambassadors were splendidly lodged here while it was held by the Bonds; the Duke of Sully was lodged here in 1594; the Duke of Boron in 1601, and the Russian ambassador in 1618. In 1594 it was bought by Sir John Spencer, knight, father-in-law of the first Earl of Northampton, and ancestor of the present marquis, who kept his mayoralty here in 1594, and made extensive alterations. The Dowager Countess of Pembroke was living here in 1609, and some years later it became the residence of Spencer, Earl of Northampton. It was held by the East India Company in 1638, and

was inhabited by Sir John Langham during the great rebellion ; and royalist prisoners, including Sir Kenelm Digby, were here retained. It miraculously escaped the fire of 1666, and in 1672 suffered temporary transformation into a Non-Conformist meeting-house, and was used for this purpose down to 1769. The office of the Penny Post occupied Crosby Hall in 1678-1679, and in 1700 the East India Company again occupied the premises, from which they removed to a building of their own. From 1810 to 1831 it was leased to a firm of packers. It was extensively repaired, public attention having been drawn to its architectural merits, in 1836, and was used for a time for benevolent purposes, fairs and the like, but, falling into disrepute for such entertainments, was leased to the Crosby Hall Literary Institute. This came to an end in 1860, and for the following seven years Crosby Hall served as the storehouse of a wine merchant. In 1868 it became a restaurant, and has been thus used ever since. It well deserves a visit as one of the few remaining bits of mediæval architecture now left in London, and for many years was held to be the finest private mansion in the city. The portions now remaining consist of the banqueting hall, a chamber sixty-nine feet in width and thirty-eight in height, having a fine open, timber roof, the throne room, formerly used when entertaining royalty, forty-two feet long and twenty-two feet in height, and the handsome council chamber, or withdrawing room,

having the same proportions, and possessing a very fine carved ceiling.

In such an age of civil strife and conspiracy as the Lancastrian-York period, the tavern was bound to play an even more important part than in an age of peaceful discussion and friendly farce. The Mitre, in the Cheap, was perhaps of all the most conspicuous at this period. Its central locality, added to other facilities, including back entrances in obscure lanes, rendered it a place especially suitable for such discussions as were then taking place. It was probably on the corner of Bread Street, from whence it was sometimes called the Mitre, in Bread Street. Another famous tavern was the Pope's Head, in Lombard Street, which is mentioned as early as 1464, when, in the reign of Edward IV., it was the scene of the wager between an Alicant and an English goldsmith as regards the superiority of their respective work. A convenient passageway led from the back of the tavern into Cornhill. The place was destroyed during the great fire, but rebuilt. Here it was that in 1718 Quin, the actor, fought the mortal combat with Bowen, in which the latter was killed. Other noted public houses of the period were the White Lion and the White Hart Inn, the last mentioned in Covent Garden. The Bell, at Westminster, and the Bear, at Bridge Foot, Southwark, were also famous halting places, where mirth and malt mixed fast and furious, and strangers halted before entering or on leaving the city. Both are

referred to by Sir John Howard, in his "Journal of Expenses." The former, which, with its stableyard, was situated on the north side of King Street, has long since passed away. Here Pepys used to dine, and here occurred the dinner described by Sir William Waller in his "Vindication," which is also mentioned by Denzil Holles in his "Memoirs." In Queen Anne's time the October Club used to meet here. The Bear was pulled down in 1761, when the houses on London Bridge were removed and the bridge widened.

CHAPTER VII.

LONDON UNDER THE TUDORS.

Accession of Henry VII.—Public Worship of the Hero King—His Coronation at Westminster—The Uprising in Favor of Lambert Simnel—The Conspiracy of Perkin Warbeck—The Imposition of Fines and Penalties on City Magnates—Henry VIII.—The Great Coronation Festivities—The Holy League—The Rise of Wolsey—The Royal Divorce at Blackfriars—The Dissolution of the Monastic Establishments and other Religious Houses—Fate of the Elsyng Hospital—The Carthusian Executions—The Sick and Starving Homeless—Re-establishment of St. Bartholomew's Hospital by Royal Charter—Christ Church—The Foundation of Bedlam—The Court of Whitehall—St. James' Palace—Distribution of Spoils—Fate of St. Faith's Belfry—Suppression of Westminster Abbey—The King's Marriages—The English Terror—St. Paul's School—St. Anthony's Pigs—Trinity House—The State of Society—Formal Entertainments—Beaufort House—Worcester House—Tower Hill a Fashionable Locality—Fisher's Folly—Famous Names in Art and Letters.

THE victory of Henry VII. at Bosworth was decisive. Six days later he entered London in triumph. He was received outside the gates by Sir Thomas Hill, who then held the mayoralty, and who, accompanied by his sheriffs, the aldermen and other civic officials, advanced to meet him. Entering the city amid the acclamations of the people, he proceeded in solemn procession to St. Paul's, where he offered

the standards which he had taken at Bosworth. This occurred on August 28, 1485. On October 30 his coronation followed. It was a very great affair; but however august the ceremonial may have been in lavish display, its grandeur derived its special significance from the good will and enthusiasm of the people. The festivities which followed were interrupted, however, by the terrible scourge which visited London that year, and to which was given the name of the "Sweating Sickness." The mayor, Sir Thomas Hill, was one of the first to succumb to the dread scourge. He was followed in office by Sir William Stocker, who had, however, only enjoyed his office for three days when he was also attacked, and followed his predecessor to the grave. Six aldermen shared their fate. A third mayor, a certain John Ward, was elected to fill Stocker's place, and retained the office until the next Michaelmas election, which placed the Irishman, Hugh Brise, in the civic chair. Thus, in the short space of six months, four different mayors were seated at Guildhall.

The accession of Henry VII. is nearly coincident with the beginning of what may be considered modern history, properly speaking. The final important changes in the European populations had been effected. The improvement of navigation was about to open up a new continent to commerce, and to accomplish a new route, as it were, to Asia, the incalculable riches of which would henceforth become acces-

sible to Western Europe. It was the dawn of a new system of relations between the nations of Europe, and the events of the reign of Henry VII. in England, and those of the reign following, may very properly be regarded as the commencement of that series of wars and internal political negotiations between the different kingdoms and nations of Europe which has continued until the present day.

But if the accession of Henry VII. marked a period in European history, it also marked a period in the history of London. The civic constitution was now settled, and the furthestmost ring of then existing suburbs had been brought within the pale of city government. The finishing touches had, to use a poetic expression, been put to the municipal fabric. The terrible chaos and confusion which the constant wars of the last few reigns had brought about caused the almost complete ruin of commerce, followed by that terrible financial depression consequent upon such conditions. When the young Earl of Richmond ascended the throne it was felt by all that an era of peace and prosperity had set in upon the kingdom. The king himself was handsome and popular, and it was hoped that his marriage with the young Princess Elizabeth of York would, by uniting in the person of his issue the rival claims of Lancaster and York, bring about a permanent cessation of hostilities between those rival factions which had so long been struggling for the possession of the throne.

The coronation of Henry VII., which took place at Westminster, on October 30, 1485, was an event of great magnitude, and one which surpassed in splendor any previous ceremony of the kind. It was itself surpassed, certainly inasmuch as popular enthusiasm was concerned, by his marriage. The last-mentioned ceremony occurred January 18, 1486. The king had postponed this event until he should himself have been crowned, so solicitous was he that his title should not be thought to come to him in virtue of his wife. He wished first to establish his own individual claims, and as he had, though descended from John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, no real hereditary right to the crown, his claims were purely personal, and his title, one might almost say, elective. Only after his own title had been fully recognized by Parliament and the nation was he willing to fulfill the promise he had made to marry Elizabeth of York. So sensitive was he on the subject of his title that he even went so far as to seek its confirmation, the following year, from the Pope as his feudal superior and suzerain, which confirmation Innocent VIII., who then sat on the throne of St. Peter, willingly granted, as he saw in the young king an augury of peace and prosperity for unhappy England.

But Henry VII. was not to enjoy an era of undisturbed and peaceful possession, for twice there arose from unexpected quarters an element of discord which, though ultimately overcome, yet seriously

threatened the welfare of the nation and the security of the throne. The uprising in favor of Lambert Simnel, the pretended Earl of Warwick, threatened to attain proportions at once formidable and disastrous. But the good humor of Henry VII. here showed forth in the highest degree; for, having won a decisive victory over Simnel and his followers at Stoke, near Warwick, he pardoned him, and made him a scullion in his kitchen. To make his humiliation even more complete, he ordered that the unfortunate Warwick, who was then suffering imprisonment in the Tower, should be taken in procession through the streets of the city, that every one might see that he was still alive. It was the last time that unfortunate man saw the familiar landmarks of London, for two years later, in 1499, he was executed in the Tower for no other reason than that he was a dangerous rival as claimant of the crown. His execution is the darkest spot in the career of Henry VII.

In defeating the conspiracy which aimed at placing Perkin Warbeck on the throne of England, by causing him to impersonate Richard, the little Duke of York, who it was publicly rumored had escaped from the Tower, Henry found far greater difficulty. Supported in his pretensions by Charles VIII., King of France, and by the Duchess of Burgundy, and later by James IV., King of Scotland, Perkin Warbeck was a far more formidable person than the unfortunate Simnel. Henry, however, acted with his usual

caution and deliberation. Determining first to substantiate the actual death of the Duke of York, he caused to be looked up two of the persons employed in the murder of the princes—namely, Forrest and Dighton—and they agreed to the same story as to the assassination of Edward V. and his brother. Their statements were made public, and had a great effect in quieting the agitation. In fact, the attempt finally came to the same abortive end as that uprising which had been started in favor of Simnel; for, on the approach of Henry VII. and his army, Warbeck, who had landed in England, and was with seven thousand followers near Taunton, despaired of success, and sought safety in the sanctuary of Beaulieu. He was captured, however, and taken to London, where he was imprisoned in the Tower, and suffered execution in November, 1499, a few days before the same fate was meted out to the Earl of Warwick.

All obstacles to his peaceful possession of the throne being now removed, Henry, who had begun his reign by measures of the greatest financial prudence, yielded to his natural inclination of avarice, and marred by this fault the otherwise perfect justice and equity of his administration. He had inaugurated his reign by what was a perfectly new departure, for he it was who, to all intents and purposes, invented the national debt. Borrowing thirty thousand marks for a specified time, he surprised his lenders by repaying the loan at the time specified. By this he was enabled, a

few years later—that is, in 1488—to obtain a loan of six thousand pounds without much difficulty. Unfortunately for his popularity, he did not find this method of obtaining funds sufficiently desirable to continue it. In 1491 he demanded, therefore, a so-called benevolence, and appointed Empson and Dudley to collect this sort of gratuitous tax.

Their conduct in London especially was signalized by the greatest brutality. They levied fines in every direction, and for the most trivial, if not wholly imaginary, reasons. Sir William Capel, one of the city's richest men, and at the time an alderman, was called on to pay a fine of two thousand seven hundred pounds for the infringement of some altogether forgotten law, and while the penalty was reduced to half of its original proportions by the influence of powerful friends at court, this was not done until he had actually been committed to the custody of the sheriff. Nor did these persecutions cease here. Others were apprehended on various trumped-up charges, and only released on the payment of very large fines. Sir Thomas Kinesworth was one of the victims of this system of taxation, or rather extortion, in 1509. He had occupied the mayoralty in 1507, some two years before. The timorous sank beneath the preferred and fictitious charges, and in two cases actually died from grief, disappointment and mortification induced thereby. These included a certain Christopher Hawes, an alderman and a man of large means, and a certain

William Fitz-William, who had held the post of mayor's deputy and sheriff under Sir Richard Haddon, who occupied the mayoral chair in 1506. Sir William Capel, however, was not so easily overcome by his adversities. Perhaps his first experience had given him courage, for when some years later the king's agents, Empson and Dudley, again came upon him, on the ground of some other alleged misuse of office and influence, and demanded this time two thousand pounds, Capel positively refused to pay one cent of the so-called fine, and calmly allowed himself to be conveyed to the compter and the sheriff's prison without protesting, and later was also equally calm on being transferred to the Tower, where he remained until the end of the reign.

The system of imposing fines for the commission of crimes extended even to the gravest offences; even high treason seems, in fact, to have been an offence for which a payment would purchase pardon. Thus in the rebellion of 1498, when the rioters under Lord Audley actually threatened London from Blackheath, and the king was even obliged to lead his troops in person against the rebels, whom he signally defeated, they were, with the exception of a few leaders who suffered the death penalty, all pardoned at so much a head. In this the reign of Henry VII. stands out in strong contrast to the excessive severity of those that followed it. The king was lenient and over-indulgent to a fault, save when he required funds,

and then he employed agents to devise methods whereby these might be obtained. Henry VII. doubtless appreciated how impossible it is to accomplish anything in the world without the necessary funds, and his very natural desire to provide suitably for the future of his dynasty may have led him to the excesses which may thus be pardoned, if not excused. That his death was not more mourned is due, probably, more to the fickleness of the populace, who, like its betters, always turns its face towards the rising sun, than to any lack of kingly virtue in the dead monarch.

Henry VIII., who succeeded his father, ascended the throne amid the rejoicings of a devoted and loyal people, and with every prospect of a splendid reign. The young king was now in his nineteenth year. He had received a broad and liberal education, and was endowed with both grace and charm of person, a certain manly beauty and great dexterity in all athletic exercises. The impetuosity of his disposition seemed to have a generous heart as its motive power, and his liberality and love of splendor endeared him rather than otherwise to his subjects. One entertainment succeeded another, the perfectly tranquil state of public affairs permitting the court to devote itself exclusively to matters of pleasure. Henry VIII., occupying himself more with the spending of his father's accumulated treasure than with increasing its proportions, the late king's agents, Empson and

Dudley, were committed to the Tower, and, in order to gratify public fancy, they were charged with the most improbable crimes, and executed the following year.

Henry VIII. ascended the throne on April 7, 1509. On June 7 following he was married to Katherine, daughter of Ferdinand, King of Arragon, and of Isabel, Queen of Castile; she was the widow of his elder brother, Arthur, Prince of Wales, and the young king and queen were crowned at Westminster on June 24 following by William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury. If the ceremonial used for the coronation of Henry VII. was held to have exceeded in splendor any that preceded it, that which was displayed for the coronation of Henry VIII. was even greater. The Earl of Surrey, who at that time held the post of treasurer of the realm, and Fox, Bishop of Winchester, keeper of the privy seal, acted as the king's advisers. Both were men of splendid tastes, and under their guidance the coronation ceremonial developed itself to an hitherto unparalleled extent. At the time when the Tower was the usual London residence of English sovereigns, it had been natural that the king should start from that fortress when proceeding to his coronation at Westminster. Later, when Westminster became and the Tower ceased to be the official residence of the sovereign, the custom was continued, and the vigil of the coronation, if not longer, was spent at the Tower.

The king dined at the Tower the day before the ceremony itself, and the afternoon was spent in receiving nobles, bishops, judges, and other high officials and distinguished personages, who had come from different parts of the kingdom. The king also received the mayor and civic officials, who gave him assurance of safe conduct through the city on the following day. That evening the installation of the Knights of the Bath took place in the chapel of St. John, in the Tower, and the newly-created knights made their vigil that night, praying and watching their armor.

Meanwhile great preparations were going on throughout the city. The streets were thoroughly cleaned and sand was sprinkled along the route of the procession. The houses were sumptuously decorated, tapestries of great value being hung from the windows and balconies, bands of music were stationed at different places, and triumphal arches, more or less elaborate, were erected at intervals along the route. The civic officials and aldermen stationed themselves on Cheapside, where the king was received by the mayor, who delivered an address, to which the king replied appropriately, the king and his train then resuming its stately progress. The procession itself consisted for the most part of royalty and its attendants, ecclesiastical, civil and military, of the great officers of state, the peers, judges and other high official personages. The accounts of the coronation of Eleanor of Provence, consort of Henry III., which

occurred in 1235, give details concerning the cavalcade of citizens of London, who, claiming the privilege of attending the king and queen as cellarers, rode forth in splendid flowing garments, embroidered in gold and silk of various colors, and formed part of the royal procession from the Tower to Westminster. They were about three hundred and sixty in number, and rode on richly caparisoned steeds, with golden bits and shining ornaments, each carrying a golden cup in his right hand as a mark of his office.

As these coronation processions, however, gradually increased in size and splendor, it was soon found impossible to accomplish the procession and the coronation on the same day. It became customary, therefore, that the sovereign should proceed in state from the Tower to Westminster the day previous to the coronation and spend the vigil of that ceremony at Westminster Palace, instead of as formerly within the city. Thus the procession from the Tower preceding the coronation of Richard II. occurred on July 15, 1377, while that august function took place on the day following. This coronation had, as we have seen, been attended with great splendor. The young king rode on a richly caparisoned horse, clothed in robes of spotless white, and attended by a multitude of nobles, knights and esquires; the gutters in the streets flowed with wine, and at the principal thoroughfares the procession was stayed, that the king might witness the exhibition of pageants; that of

the Goldsmiths Company, on the Cheap, being particularly splendid and representing a castle, from the four sides of which wine poured as from a fountain, while damsels in white dresses, standing on the towers, blew gold leaves from golden horns upon the king, and sprinkled the ground before him with golden florins. Succeeding monarchs were attended with the same solemn state on this great occasion, and we learn that in his progress from the Tower to Westminster Henry IV. was attended by no less than nine hundred horses, so great was the number of nobles, knights and esquires who accompanied the king.

If all these processions and pageants had been brilliant, that which took Henry VIII. and Katherine of Arragon from the Tower to Westminster was the most brilliant of them all. The procession was entirely in keeping with the love of display and gorgeous pageantry which was the dominating fashion of the age. The young king, who rode on a horse splendidly caparisoned with purple velvet, embroidered in gold and edged with ermine, was attired in a magnificent robe of crimson velvet, encrusted with diamonds, rubies, emeralds, pearls and other rich and precious stones. The queen rode in a litter, covered and richly apparelled, and the palfries had trappings of white and gold. She was attired in a robe of white satin, her hair hung loosely down her back, caught up at intervals and intertwined with pearls and jewels, while on her head was a small crown of

precious stones. And if the street pageant was one of until then unknown magnificence, the coronation ceremony at Westminster was also of a splendor heretofore unequalled. Since the days of Edward the Confessor, who applied to Pope Nicholas II. to issue a rescript making Westminster Abbey the future place of coronation of English monarchs, those august ceremonies had always taken place within the venerable edifice, but never before had any coronation attained the degree of spectacular grandeur which characterized that of Henry VIII., nor ever before had there been so brilliant and so distinguished an assemblage. The difficulty attending travel did not admit in those days of the attendance of foreign princes as representatives of brother sovereigns, as is customary at similar functions at the present day, and the coronation of Henry VIII. lacked therefore the pomp of the presence of foreign royalties and diplomatic representatives, but what it lacked in this regard it possessed in another. Never before had so many peers and peeresses, nobles, knights, esquires, and other persons of high estate and high-born dames, been brought together, and the splendor of the men's attire and that of the dresses of the women made the scene one of great and varied magnificence. Who could have thought that the woman, who with Henry shared the honors of the occasion, would end her days in solitude and silence, repudiated by the man at whose side she then sat enthroned?

Nave, Westminster Abbey

•

•

•

The first two or three years of the new reign were years of perfect calm and peace. Friendly relations with other countries were maintained, and throughout the kingdom all seemed orderly and prosperous. Impatient, however, of acquiring a distinction throughout Europe other than that which belonged to him in virtue of his birth, his position and his opulence, Henry VIII. soon involved the country in a series of foreign wars, which, as they had, however, little or no influence on the development, civic or commercial, of the capital city, belong exclusively to the general history of the nation, and have little part in our present subject. It is necessary, nevertheless, to follow briefly the political changes of the times, in order that we may have a proper understanding of the conditions which led to one of the greatest revolutions which ever befell the city—the suppression of the monastic and other religious establishments, and the sequestration and redistribution of their holdings in London and its suburbs into lay and secular hands.

Henry being, as we have seen, anxious to show his metal in the pursuit of war, looked about him for a reason which would warrant the assumption of hostilities with that hereditary enemy of England across the channel. About this time the Holy League had been formed between the Pope, the emperor, the king of Spain and the republic of Venice against Louis XII., king of France. Henry at once joined the league, and, summoning a Parliament, demanded an

found in him a generous patron, and all who were distinguished in letters, art or science sought an introduction to him and attended his levees. Finally Leo X. appointed him his legate in England, and he thus obtained the right of holding a legatine court, and that of visitation of the monasteries and other religious establishments.

Europe at this time was in a ferment of excitement and agitation over Luther and the "Reformation," and while Henry VIII., who had been reared in the strictest piety, went so far as to write a defence of the Seven Sacraments, as against the teachings advanced by Luther, for which he received from Leo X. the title of "Defender of the Faith," a title still borne by the sovereigns of England, yet circumstances arose by which, a few years later, his sentiments towards the Papacy came to be entirely reversed. Though Katherine of Arragon had been united to Henry for upwards of eighteen years, and had borne him several children, yet the king now commenced to express those doubts which he said he entertained regarding the lawfulness of their marriage tie. These doubts the king based on the Mosaic law, which threatens with childlessness he who espouses his brother's widow. Now Katherine, as it will be remembered, had had as her first husband Arthur, Prince of Wales, the king's elder brother, and while she had borne Henry several children, all had died in infancy save the Princess Mary, who was of a deli-

cate constitution. The king urged that the doubts as to Mary's legitimacy might in the future seriously endanger the succession of the crown. The truth was, however, that the king had already fixed his affections on a woman other than his wife, and that Anne Boleyn was already the mistress of his heart.

Inclination and policy seeming thus to concur, the king determined to dispatch an ambassador to Rome, to lay his case before the Pope. His selection fell on William Knight, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who notwithstanding his protest that he was old, and that his sight was failing, was compelled to depart on his mission. Clement VII., who then occupied the chair of Peter, was at the time a prisoner of the Emperor Charles V. He received the king's ambassador kindly at Orvieto, whither he had escaped, but on being pressed to give an answer to the king's request for an annulment of his marriage, he demurred. After many negotiations and much delay, he finally agreed to appoint a commission to look into the matter, and try the validity of the marriage, and Cardinal Campeggio and Cardinal Wolsey were appointed by him as judges of the case.

Cardinal Campeggio arrived in England on October 7, 1528, and the two legates opened their court in London on May 31, 1529. The court was held at Blackfriars—that is, in the hall of that famous Dominican priory—and the king and queen were cited to appear before it. The trial was spun out until July 23,

on which day Cardinal Campeggio prorogued the court until October 1. Henry, who had been eagerly expecting a verdict in his favor, was naturally much disappointed. A few days later both the king and the queen received a citation to appear in person before the Pope at Rome, that he might himself sit in judgment on the case. This was received by Henry as if it had been a verdict against his side of the case, and he did not postpone for very long the venting of his wrath on Wolsey, in which line of conduct he was encouraged by the ambitious Anne Boleyn and her friends, who dreaded a return of the vast power and influence which the cardinal had heretofore exercised over the king. On October 9 of the same year an indictment was preferred against him in the King's Bench, for breach of "præmunire," an accusation based on his acceptance of the legatine authority. The great seal was taken from him and delivered to Sir Thomas More. Wolsey was ordered to leave London; his residence York Place, and all its magnificent furniture and plate, were seized, and he was commanded to retire to Esher, a country seat which he possessed near Hampton Court.

On the meeting of Parliament, which had not been summoned for seven years, on November 3 following, the House of Lords voted a charge of forty-four articles against Wolsey. The articles were sent down to the House of Commons, where he was valiantly defended by Thomas Cromwell, whom he had raised

from a very lowly station to his then brilliant position. The end of the drama was now fast approaching. While permitted to retain the archiepiscopal See of York, he felt that it was only a temporary respite; nor was he wrong in his surmise. His enemies continued their attack, and, feeling unsafe while he lived, urged the king to completely destroy him. On November 4, 1530, he was arrested on the trumped-up charge of high treason, and he knew then that the end had come. Cited to appear in London, he started on the journey; but long years of toil and anxiety had completely shattered his health, and dysentery setting in, he could make but slow progress. On Saturday, November 26, he reached Leicester Abbey, and feeling that he was dying, he said to the lord abbot, "Father, I come to leave my bones among you." On the morning of November 29 he died, and all that was left of that brilliant genius was hurriedly buried in a plain wooden coffin.

The death of Wolsey had removed from the scene one of the most ardent defenders of the papal rights, and one of the greatest barriers which existed between Henry and the consummation of his plans. His first move was to cause Parliament to declare him the protector and supreme head of the Church and clergy in England, and by strict interpretation of the so-called Statute of Provisors, he transferred still more of the hitherto recognized authority of the Pope

to his own person. His quarrel with the Pope was now irreconcilable, and having fully determined in his own mind to have his own way in the matter, he caused his marriage with Anne Boleyn, whom he had previously created Marchioness of Pembroke, to be privately celebrated on January 25, 1533. Having first compelled Parliament to pass an act prohibiting any appeal to Rome in any case of matrimony, divorces, wills or other suits recognizable in the ecclesiastical courts, he then called upon Cranmer, who, on the death of Wareham, had succeeded to the See of Canterbury, to hold a court to inquire into the validity of his marriage with Katherine of Arragon. That the sentence would be in favor of annulment was a foregone conclusion, and on May 28 Cranmer rendered the desired decision. By a subsequent sentence he ratified the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn, and on Whitsunday following she was crowned with great splendor at Westminster. She passed through the city from the Tower to Westminster in great and solemn state, having gone by water two days before from Greenwich to the Tower, accompanied by barges containing the mayor, the aldermen, and the representatives of the crafts and companies. The procession through the streets was one of the greatest splendor, and nothing was left undone that would lend lustre to her progress or her subsequent coronation at Westminster.

The time had now arrived for the finishing stroke

which was at one blow to destroy the last vestige of papal authority in England, and entirely change the character and aspect of London—the suppression of the monasteries, and the sequestration of their vast holdings and other property. Already some of the minor monasteries had begun to feel the hand of the king. The work that was completely to transform London was begun on May 11, 1531, by the suppression of the house of Augustinian Canons attached to the Elsyng Hospital, an asylum for the blind; and a few months later came the dissolution of the venerable priory at Aldgate, the Holy Trinity; the canons scattered among other houses of the order, and the property was turned over to Sir Thomas Audley, who had succeeded Sir Thomas More as lord chancellor. On Audley's death the property passed to Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, who had married his daughter, and after Norfolk's execution, in 1572, to his son, the Earl of Suffolk, who sold the manor house and precinct to the city of London. The adjoining chapel was made a parish church. This was followed shortly by the execution of Elizabeth Barton, the so-called "Holy Maid of Kent," who, with two monks from the cathedral of Canterbury, two friars and the rectors of one of London's best-known churches, were hanged and beheaded. It was but the first of a series of persecutions. Three Carthusian priors, including the head of that famous institution, the London Charter House (Chartreuse), and six friars, were

hanged and quartered at Tyburn. The date of this tragedy was May 4, 1535. The head of the last-mentioned venerable ecclesiastic was set up on London Bridge, while one of his limbs was put up over his own gateway—the same gateway which still forms the entrance of Charter House Square—and there the passing crowd could gaze upon the quivering and decomposing flesh of the aged man as it rotted and fell in pieces to the ground, and was there devoured by hungry dogs.

The same year Fisher and More were beheaded on Tower Hill, and what one of the most eminent English historians has called the British Terror was then fully inaugurated. Executions were now pushed with even greater vigor, and the streets of London witnessed long processions of unfortunates who—for having incurred the royal displeasure by refusing to recognize the doctrine of “royal supremacy” in ecclesiastical matters—were hurried to their common fate, the gallows or the block.

The assumption by the king of what had been previously held to be the undisputed rights of the Pope placed the whole English ecclesiastical world at his mercy. The end of the monastic system and of the monasteries was now at hand. That wonderful edifice which it had taken so many centuries to erect, and which had grown so vast and powerful, now fell to pieces, like a house of cards. Those magnificent buildings and vast estates, which had become the

pride of Christendom, were seized, and either destroyed or given over into the possession of some favorite of the moment. In London the suppression of the monastic establishments left unoccupied some of the most stately edifices and some of the most valuable land areas in the city. Thus Blackfriars, Whitefriars, Greyfriars, St. Martin-le-Grand, Austin Friars, Crutched Friars, and innumerable other similar great religious establishments, which until then had been like small cities in themselves, peopled by a crowd of pious and devout souls, bent on their various missions of love and charity, now became untenanted and threatened with destruction. Some of the greatest historical landmarks of the city thus disappeared.

While it is worthy of notice that no abbeyes existed within the walls of the city, the monks having invariably chosen more sheltered and secluded situations, and left to the friars the selection of busier localities, yet many houses throughout the land which had mitred abbots and abbesses at their head held land in London, and the fall of Westminster Abbey, of Battle Abbey, of Barking, and of Bermondsey, and of others even further from the city, and which institutions owned large properties in London, was in a great measure due to the seizure and the sequestration of these estates. By the time that the year 1538 had come to be inscribed on the calendar of Christendom, the transformation was complete, and, the ecclesiastical world being entirely routed from its possessions, the

division of the spoils began in earnest. Besides the ruin of so many splendid buildings and the sacrifice of so many valuable lives, the suppression of the religious houses worked another great evil. Many of the monasteries and nunneries had been especially devoted to the care of the sick, the aged and the infirm, and their suppression left their patients uncared for and quite adrift in the world. The blind at Elsyng Spittle, the halt at St. Giles and the leprous at St. Thomas were thrown helpless out into the world. A period of terrible distress and misery followed. The streets of London resounded at the same time to the cries of the monks and nuns, who, dragged from their pious retreats, were hurried to their death, and to those of the unfortunates, who, deprived of their caretaking and devoted nurses, cried out in loneliness and agony throughout the city.

The evil became so terrible that the mayor, aldermen and common council addressed a joint petition to the king, praying that he might at least grant them four houses in which they could house and shelter the sick and the starving. Those which they thus asked for were "Saynt Mary Spytell," "Saynt Bartylmewes Spytell," "Saynt Thomas Spytell" and the "New Abbey on Tower Hill." Henry VIII. was far too engrossed, however, in his schemes for the appropriation of all ecclesiastical property to heed the cries to which his attention was thus called, and the petition lay unnoticed for some eight years or

more. In 1544, however, the civic authorities succeeded in obtaining St. Bartholomew the Great, and the hospital was refounded by Henry VIII., who gave it a new charter, which returned to it the greater proportion of its former revenues, "for the continual relief and help of an hundred sore and diseased," being "moved thereto with great pity for and towards the relief and succor and help of the poor, aged, sick, low and impotent people, . . . lying and going about begging in the common streets of the city of London, and the suburbs of the same, infected with divers great and horrible sicknesses and diseases." In 1546 Greyfriars was also given to the civic authorities, and an elaborate scheme for charity on an extensive scale was formed, by which the church, under the appellation of Christ Church, was to be made parochial, and the neighboring parishes of St. Nicholas Shambles and St. Ewen were to be united under two clergymen, one a vicar and the other to be called a visitor. The plan was, however, only in part carried out. The former Augustinian priory at Bishopsgate Without, which had been founded by one Simon Fitz-Mary, sheriff of London in 1242, was in 1547 also turned over by the king to the city of London, and it became a hospital for the insane, under the name of the Bethlehem (Bedlam) Royal Hospital, Moorfields, the management of the institution being turned over ten years later to the governors of Bridewell Hospital. The original building, though it

St. James Palace

.

St. James Palace

that is, that which belonged to Jesus Chapel, attached to St. Faith's under St. Paul's—Henry VIII. amused himself playing at dice with Sir Miles Partridge. The king having lost, that historic tower under the shadow of which so many public events of importance occurred was demolished and the bells of the old belfry melted down and sold by order of their new owner.

In 1545 the church of Whitefriars and the steeple of the church of Blackfriars suffered much the same fate as the belfry of St. Faith's, and were torn down by vandal hands. The same year the beautiful choir of the same church suffered destruction. The splendid oaken stalls were wrenched out violently and sold to the first bidder, being actually knocked down by the auctioneer for the miserable sum of fifty pounds. The church of the Augustinian or Austin friars experienced the same fate. The pages of contemporary chroniclers are filled with accounts of denuding of sanctuaries, despoiling of churches, destruction of venerable monuments, and the ruin of ancient houses and other historic landmarks. The alterations made in the aspect of the city by all these sad and distressing changes was, as will easily be understood, very great and unfortunate. Only a few traces of the old London were left to posterity. The choir of St. Bartholomew the Great escaped, and still stands to-day, a splendid example of Norman architecture, and some traces of the ancient cloisters may be found em-

bedded, as it were, in the adjacent buildings of the neighboring alleys and lanes ; but of those huge conventual establishments, Blackfriars and Whitefriars, nothing but the name remains.

The fate of the city also befell the suburbs. The age of monasteries and sheltered gardens gave way to that of parks and palaces. Westminster Abbey itself suffered, it is true, but few changes at the time of the dissolution of the monastic houses. It has perhaps experienced greater changes in the alterations of the last two centuries. The abbey itself, however, was suppressed and the monks scattered. An act of Parliament, passed in 1536, had already granted to Westminster the style of city. It remained for Henry VIII. in 1540 to create it a See ; thus, while depriving Westminster of its abbot, he gave it a bishop, and though the newly-erected See was abolished in 1550, ten years later, yet it has continued to retain its civic title, and in an act passed at Westminster in 1604 we find it described as the "manor and city of Westminster." The abbot was replaced by a dean, and a chapter of twelve canons established. The abbot's house went as spoils to the omnivorous Lord Wentworth, the other buildings being variously distributed. It is not surprising, considering the changes thus effected, that Henry VIII. preferred his residence at Whitehall to that which he had occupied at Westminster ; for if he retained the slightest feeling or sentiment, it would certainly have been difficult for him to have resided

comfortably amid the shrines which he had caused to be demolished, the chapels which he had caused to be disendowed, and near to the graves of his father and mother, whom he had deprived of the services which they had deemed necessary to the peaceful repose of their souls, and had endeavored to secure by so many safeguards. Their son, who had on his accession received the renewed oath of the abbot of Westminster to provide the accustomed masses for the repose of the souls of his royal parents, now deprived the abbot of his title and his parents of their masses. A few of the ancient observances continued, it is true, to be celebrated in the chapel of Henry VII. until the death of Henry VIII., but even these ceased on the accession of Edward VI. The fate of Westminster was also shared by the abbey of Bermondsey, Surrey, but this great historic pile suffered more severely and was laid low.

The king had now accomplished his purpose, but let it not be supposed that he enjoyed in perfect peace and tranquillity the fruits of his plunder and violence; nor did Anne Boleyn, the partner and possibly in a large measure the instigator of his operations. In 1536 the long-expected heir appeared, but she was delivered of him dead. This did not, as may be imagined, have the effect of appeasing the anger of the king, which had been inflamed against her by the insinuations of the Viscountess de Rochefort, the wife of the queen's brother. Meanwhile Jane, daughter

of Sir John Seymour, a young lady of singular beauty and talent, and who was a maid of honor of the queen, had completely captivated the king's fancy. This probably led him to lend a much more willing ear to those persons who hinted at unpleasant things in connection with the queen's virtue. However this may have been, Anne Boleyn was sent to the Tower, on May 2, 1536, with four of her alleged paramours, Boureton, Norris, Smeton and Weston, who were tried and executed. The queen herself was tried by a jury of peers, over which her own uncle, the Duke of Norfolk, presided as lord high steward. Her condemnation was a foregone conclusion, and on May 9 of the same year the woman who had been the cause of all the misery of Katherine of Arragon, who had destroyed a home and almost wrecked a kingdom, paid by her death at the block the penalty of her folly. Though probably more weak and vain than determinedly wicked, her fate excited but little commiseration, and the king, not content with the severity of her punishment, obtained from Cranmer, then Archbishop of Canterbury, a sentence of annulment of his marriage with Anne Boleyn, and had her offspring declared illegitimate.

The day after Anne Boleyn's execution the king caused his marriage with Jane Seymour to be celebrated. Katherine of Arragon had died on January 7. Jane bore him one son afterwards, Edward VI., and died a few days later. But London was still to

enjoy a number of marriage and funeral pageants, for Jane's death was followed within a few months by Henry's marriage with Anne, Princess of Cleves. This marriage was annulled in July, 1540, on the ground of her having been previously contracted for. These events were followed on July 28, 1540, by the king's marriage with Katherine Howard, niece of the Duke of Norfolk, which, though it may have been viewed by the Catholics as more favorable to their cause, could not have been regarded by them but with disgust and aversion, considering that Henry already had one wife living in the person of Anne of Cleves. Katherine Howard did not, however, long enjoy her new honors; for, accused of adultery, Culpeper and Dirham, said to be her lovers, were tried and executed December 10, 1541. Her own trial followed, with that of the Viscountess de Rochefort, who had been the means of bringing the queen and her lovers together. Both were condemned and beheaded at the Tower, February 13, 1542. The year following Henry married his sixth wife, Katherine Parr, daughter of Sir Thomas Parr, of Kendal, widow of Lord Latimer, a woman of virtue, but of such radical views in matters of religion that the king, who, though arrogating to himself the highest ecclesiastical functions and prerogatives, yet was distinctly conservative as regarded Catholic doctrine, became seriously displeased with her; but her tact and caution saved her, and she managed to outlive her husband.

If Katherine Parr had succeeded in escaping the fate which had overtaken two of her predecessors, London was yet to be witness and the Tower the scene of other bloody executions. Catholics and Protestants were conveyed in the same hurdles to execution—Abel, Featherstone and Powell for denying the royal supremacy; Barnes, Gerard and Jerome for denying the six articles. Even the venerable Countess of Salisbury, that princess who was the descendant of a long line of English monarchs, suffered the death penalty, as the mother of the king's kinsman, Reginald, Cardinal Pole, and later Papal legate in England. The Duke of Norfolk and his son, the Earl of Surrey, were now seized and conveyed to the Tower, accused of a conspiracy against the crown—a purely trumped-up charge, based on the fact that they had assumed without permission the arms of Edward the Confessor. Surrey, being a commoner, his trial was more expeditious. Condemned for high treason, he was executed on January 19, 1547. The trial of the Duke of Norfolk was, however, delayed by a series of circumstances; and the delay saved his life. The king was himself fast approaching his end, and, fearing lest he should die before the execution of the Duke of Norfolk, he urged the Commons to hasten the bill of attainder, and issued orders for the execution on the morning of January 28, 1547. News having reached the Tower, however, that the king himself had died that

morning, the execution was delayed, and the life of the illustrious nobleman saved thereby. That a man guilty of so many crimes should have been able to die in apparent peace is certainly to be wondered at. The king's end, however, was quiet. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was by his side, requested that the king, who was then speechless, should give him some sign of his faith in Christ. Henry squeezed that prelate's hand, and immediately expired.

If great had been the political chaos, and consequent financial and commercial depression, which had characterized the later Plantagenet reigns, while the country and the city were torn asunder by Lancastrian and Yorkist disputes, great also was the impetus given to affairs in general, and business enterprises in particular, by the accession of that popular hero, Henry VII.; for not only did confidence return to the people, but that monarch gave every evidence of his personal interest in the progress of all commercial interests. In fact, four of the city companies are indebted to him for their charters of incorporation—the Bakers, who received theirs as early in the reign as 1486; the Coopers, to whom a charter was granted in 1501, by which the right was given them to search and gauge all beer, ale and soap vessels within the city of London and two miles round the suburbs, for doing which they were to pay a farthing for each cask; the Poulterers in 1504; and lastly, though by no means leastly, that great company, the Merchant

Tailors, whose working charter bears also the signature of the hero king. Henry VIII. was far too busy with his ecclesiastical spoliation schemes to occupy himself much with the city companies. Still the Innholders managed to obtain a charter from him in the early part of the reign.

If many ecclesiastical foundations owe their destruction, one there is that owes its foundation to Henry VIII. This foundation is the church and independent parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields; for, though it had existed as a parish as early as the middle of the fifteenth century, yet until 1535 it was dependent upon St. Margaret's, Westminster. It cannot be said that the king was entirely unselfish in the new arrangement of which he was the author; for it is given, as the rather surprising and extraordinary reason for his benevolence in the matter, that the parishioners, having "no parish church, did resort to the parish church of St. Margaret's, in Westminster, and were thereby found to bring their bodies by the court gate of Whitehall, which the said Henry then misliking caused the church in the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields to be there erected and made a parish there."

Of other institutions for which the initiative was taken in the reign, St. Paul's School merits perhaps, not only chronologically, but for other considerations, the first place. This famous institution, which stood formerly on the east side of St. Paul's churchyard,

was founded in 1512 for one hundred and fifty-three "poor men's children," by Dr. John Colet, dean of St. Paul's, the friend of Erasmus and son of Sir Henry Colet, mercer, and lord mayor in 1486 and 1495. The boys were to be admitted without restriction as to position or country, and were to be taught free of any charge. The number, one hundred and fifty-three, was selected in allusion to the number of fishes caught by St. Peter. The education, which was to be strictly classical, was to be dispensed by a master, submaster and chaplain, and the presentations were to be in the gift of the master of the Mercers' Company. The original building was destroyed in the great fire of 1666, but another was erected in its place on the same site. A new structure was put up in 1823. The present school is near Addison Road Station, West Kensington, where the Mercers' Company purchased sixteen acres, and in 1880 erected a new schoolhouse, from the design of Barnes Williams. The school to-day has the care of one thousand boys. Some of the most eminent of scholars have owed their training to this institution, and among the number have been John Leland, the antiquary; Sir Anthony Denny, the "friend" of Henry VIII.; William Whitaker, master of St. John's College, Cambridge; William Camden, the great antiquary; John Milton; the great Duke of Marlborough; Robert Nelson, the author of "Fasts and Festivals;" Edmund Halley, the astronomer; Samuel Pepys, the

diarist ; John Strype, the ecclesiastical historian ; Sir Frederick Pollock, Lord Chancellor Truro and others.

Another institution of much interest, though less importance, since it was suppressed on the dissolution of the ecclesiastical establishments, was the Hospital and Free School of St. Anthony, which stood opposite Finch Lane, in Threadneedle Street, where the French church afterwards stood. Archbishop Heath, Archbishop Whitgift, Sir Thomas More and other eminent men were educated at this school. The institution possessed, among others, one very singular privilege. The city laws concerning food were, as is known, very strict in the Middle Ages, and all unwholesome meat was rigorously destroyed. All swine "found in the street," or in the fosses, or in the suburbs, were to be killed ; but those pigs found in the street which were unfit for the shambles it became customary to hand over to the proctor of St. Anthony's Hospital, who fastened a bell to the neck of each, and sent them forth again to find their own living. This time they were, however, "privileged pigs," and protected from all hindrance or interference ; for it was distinctly ordered that all pigs bearing a St. Anthony's bell should be permitted to roam and root, unmolested and undisturbed, until they were fat enough, when they were killed for the benefit of the hospital.

Trinity House owes its inception to Sir Thomas Spert, comptroller of the navy under Henry VIII., and

he it was who was appointed its first master. The date of incorporation is March 20, 1514. The corporation was made to consist of a master, deputy-master, wardens, assistants and elder brethren, and had as its object the increase and encouragement of navigation, the regulation of lighthouses and sea marks, the securing of a body of skilled and efficient pilots for the navy and mercantile service, and the management and regulation of all matters not actually connected with the admiralty. The old hall at Deptford in which the corporation met was pulled down in 1787, and replaced by a building which is still standing. Their present London headquarters, on the north side of Tower Hill, was erected in 1793-1795, from the designs of Samuel Wyatt. It consists of a main body and wings of an Ionic order on a rusticated basement. Over the windows are medallions, with portraits in low relief of George III. and his consort, Charlotte of Mecklenburgh-Strelitz, and others representing lighthouses and other emblematic devices.

Whatever harshness and cruelty there may have remained in the methods of the first two Tudor reigns, there can be no question but that the manners became during these much more polished and courtly and less martial than they had been under previous dynasties. Not only did much more entertaining occur at court, but Margaret, Queen of Scotland, sister of Henry VIII., held quite a court of her own at Scotland Yard, opposite Whitehall, where

she was pleased to extend her distinguished patronage to all those who either in public or private life had attained any distinction. To Wolsey is perhaps due the introduction into England of the formal and systematic mode of entertaining. His dinners and levees at York House were the height and perfection of the elegance then known, and his example was emulated by others socially and politically ambitious. Indeed, Sir Thomas More, at Beaufort House, Chelsea, and the Earl of Bedford, at Worcester House, on the Strand, gave large and splendid entertainments, and well earned their merited reputation for hospitality. But though the Strand had been paved in 1532, it being then "full of pits and sloughs, very perilous and noisome," yet it had not attained that high degree of popularity which rendered it during subsequent reigns the favorite residential quarter of fashionable society. Tower Hill was in those days still a distinctly fashionable locality. The French ambassador resided there, and Lumley House, the residence of Sir Thomas Wyatt, was there situated, it having been erected on a plot of ground which had formerly belonged to the Crutched Friars.

Though in one sense the manners had changed, yet it is nevertheless true that a certain barbarity still obtained, which barbarity is best exemplified by the fact that a cockpit adjoined Whitehall, the king's palace, just as to-day every well-equipped mansion possesses a billiard hall. Indeed, cock-fighting was

still a fashionable method of entertaining one's guests after a banquet; nor did the ladies disdain on occasion to participate in the exciting sport. What was done by the court and the nobility was, of course, also practiced by the lesser world, and not only were the amusements of fashionable life emulated, but the method of life copied. The most conspicuous example of this is found perhaps in the case of one Jasper Fisher, a freeman of the Goldsmiths' Company and a justice of the peace, who caused to be erected in Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate Street, a palatial residence, with gardens, bowling-alleys and other appurtenances, and there lived in such magnificence that the palace obtained the name of "Fisher's Folly," by which it continued to be known. It came later into the possession of the Earl of Oxford, who here entertained Queen Elizabeth; and it became subsequently the residence of Sir Roger Manars. In the reign of James I. it had become the property of the Campbells, from whom it passed to the Hamiltons. Under Charles II. the old Countess of Devonshire resided within its spacious walls, and there entertained both the king and his august consort. In 1670 it was seized under the "Act for the Suppression of Conventicles," and was one of the places "appointed to be used every Lord's day for the celebration of divine worship." It was used as a Baptist chapel until 1870, when the parishioners removed to a new building at Stoke Newington, the building in Devonshire Square

being acquired by the Metropolitan Railway Company.

Popular amusements and popular customs do not change as rapidly or as easily as the habits of fashionable society. Indeed culture, such as it was, was limited to the very few. There are not many names by which to conjure with during this period. It is true that Caxton had in 1491 produced his first printed work at the Almonry, Tothill Street, while the guest of the abbot of Westminster; and that Holbein was much esteemed and feted, the great artist being, in fact, an honored guest at the king's palace at Whitehall. We have also the names of Roger Ascham and William Cecil, but very few others besides. The people still had the same rough amusements and rougher existence, and the condition of the streets, which are described as "full of pits and sloughs, very perilous and noisome," not to speak of the peregrinations of St. Anthony's pigs, could not have been conducive to what the French would call "*la vie de la rue*." A great change came over the aspect of the city under the reigns which were to follow.

CHAPTER VIII.

LONDON UNDER THE TUDORS (CONTINUED).

Edward VI.—The Duke of Somerset made Protector—The Building of Somerset House—The Bridewell Asylum—The Founding of Christ's Hospital—The "Blue Coat" Boys—Southwark made a Ward Without—The Lady Jane Dudley Incident—Accession of Mary—Cardinal Pole, the Pope's Legate—The Triumph of Elizabeth—The Opening of the Royal Exchange—The Establishment of Doctor's Commons—The Tragedy of Fotheringay—London's Part in the Defence Against the Spanish Armada—The Founding of Westminster School—The Merchant Tailors' School—The Establishment of Gresham College—Social Side of the Elizabethan Period—The Strand a Fashionable Locality—Cecil House—Arundel House—Russell House—Salisbury House—The Social Status of Finsbury—Great Names in Literature—The Birth of the Theatre—State of the Taverns—The Mitre, in Cheap—The Boar's Head, in East Cheap—Bankside—The Nag's Head, in Southwark.

HENRY VIII. had in 1544 caused Parliament to pass an act by which the heirs male of his body were to be preferred to the heirs female, at the same time restoring the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth, to the succession. By this act, Edward, his son by Jane Seymour, succeeded him as Edward VI. This prince being, however, only in his tenth year, Henry VIII. had by his last will and testament appointed sixteen executors, to whom during the young king's minority

the government of the kingdom was entrusted. With these executors, who included Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Wriothesley, lord chancellor, and Hereford, lord chamberlain, there were also appointed twelve counsellors, who, while possessing no immediate power, were to assist the king's executors in their deliberations. The first act of the combined tribunal absolutely defeated the king's intentions, for they immediately appointed Edward, Earl of Hereford, the king's maternal uncle, protector of the realm and governor of the king's person. Desirous of supplying the place of those peerages which had fallen by attainder and failure of issue, the late king had before his demise made a new creation of nobility, and raised to higher rank in the peerage a number of those who were already included in that body. Thus Wriothesley became Earl of Southampton, Lisle Earl of Warwick, Sir Thomas Seymour, brother of the protector, Baron Seymour of Sudeley, and the protector himself Duke of Somerset.

Somerset's ambition now knew absolutely no bounds. He obtained from Edward VI. a patent entirely reversing the will of the late king, and granting him full regal powers. Having now reached the height of his ambition, he felt that the dignity and the exaltation of his position required that he should reside in a palace of regal proportions and in keeping with the high authority with which he had been entrusted. He commenced therefore in 1549 the building of

Somerset House, which he determined should be the largest and most magnificent residence in England. Two Inns appertaining to the See of Worcester and Lichfield, and which were situated on the Strand, were pulled down to make way for it, and the great cloister on the north side of St. Paul's, containing the famous "Dance of Death," as well as the priory church of the knights hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell, were demolished to find stones wherewith to erect it. Unfortunately, but few men are permitted to attain their heart's desire, and he did not live to see its completion. The wondrous pile had hardly commenced to rear its outline against the English sky before his reign of authority was brought to an abrupt and tragic close. Once the regal authority was invested in him, he paid but little heed or attention to the opinion of the executive and councillor board appointed by the late king. He alienated the support of the nobility by courting the people, destroyed his own popularity with the latter by the pomp and extravagance of his mode of life, and incurred the bitter enmity of the Catholics by pulling down churches to obtain the materials for the erection of the gigantic structure which he destined as his residence. Things grew rapidly from bad to worse, until he was left without supporters. A league was now formed against him, and he was finally seized and confined in the Tower; but, having asked the pardon of those associates whose rights he had disregarded, he

.

'

'

.

Somerset House

temporarily regained his liberty. This, however, he did not enjoy long. He was tried for high treason, condemned and executed on the scaffold on Tower Hill on January 22, 1552. The king's health was very delicate and he did not long survive him, and a little over a year later, on July 6, 1553, his royal charge passed away at Greenwich, in the sixteenth year of his age and the seventh of his reign.

The metamorphosis which had begun in London during the last reign progressed to its conclusion; nor was the religious persecution in any way abated. Execution followed execution with terrible rapidity. It soon came to be absolutely imperative that some order should be established in place of the frightful chaos which existed in all public affairs at the time of the late king's death, and steps were taken in this direction. The first years of Edward's reign were taken up therefore in arranging and regulating the hospitals, and reducing their management to some kind of order, and also to the adjustment of their finances. To this end committees were formed of aldermen and common councillors, who met at stated times and discussed the way of governing the charities to the best advantage. The condition of the sick and the starving, who had been deprived of both their shelter and their food by the suppression of the religious establishments, was deplorable in the extreme. They wandered through the streets, crying out in their agony for assistance, or went from door to door, seeking help and protection.

The alleys and lanes were infested with lepers, old men and old women, and persons in all stages of consumption, cancer and other terrible afflictions. The situation became finally so grave that in 1552 Sir Richard Dobbles, then lord mayor, summoned the most prominent citizens to assemble in their respective parish churches, where he directed that they should be addressed by "aldermen and other grave persons," and by them exhorted to aid the civic officials with all the means in their power in providing for the poor and the suffering, and in reorganizing the most important charities. The appeal was successful, and its result eminently satisfactory. New life was almost immediately imparted to the revived hospital of St. Bartholomew, which Henry VIII. had founded; the former house of the Greyfriars at Newgate fitted up as a school for the children of the indigent; and the Hospital of St. Thomas of Acon, which had been moved to Southwark, purchased from the crown, and under the name of the Hospital of St. Thomas the Apostle opened for the reception of the poor, the impotent, the lame and the blind.

The young king was appealed to in person, the following year, in behalf of the great work. Edward VI. responded willingly, and granted the royal palace of Bridewell to the city of London, to be used as a workhouse and a house of correction, the endowments granted by Henry VIII. to the Savoy being transferred to it. Finally, on June 26, 1553, Edward VI.

signed the letters-patent whereby the whole modern system of municipal charities was inaugurated. With the exception of Bridewell, all these foundations still exist, and Bridewell has left its legacy in the name which is now used throughout the country for a temporary prison. While the palace thus generously bestowed on the city by Edward VI. owed its erection to his predecessor, yet there had been another and older palace on the same site before it. Though the site itself could scarcely have been dry, and suitable for purposes of habitation prior to the beginning of the thirteenth century, yet Henry III. seems to have resided here on various occasions, if not John. Comparatively few details of its early history have, however, descended to us; but, like the neighboring Savoy, it was probably foreshore before it became royal property. A new palace was erected by Henry VIII., to accommodate Charles V. on the occasion of his visit to England, but he did not occupy it. He was instead lodged at the Dominican priory, commonly called Blackfriars, a part of his suite, however, being lodged at Bridewell, and a temporary bridge and covered passage built between the two. For the remainder of his retinue accommodation was secured at that famous inn, the St. Lawrence, otherwise called Bosom's Inn, in St. Lawrence Lane, Cheapside. Henry VIII., however, seemed to fancy the site, and here it was that he and the unfortunate Katherine of Arragon resided, while the legatine court sat on the

divorce question at Blackfriars, across the Fleet. Though passing from royal proprietorship, as we have seen, under Edward VI., it did not permanently remain a workhouse, as was intended. It was used by the civic authorities for various purposes, and though in a great part destroyed during the great fire in 1666, some of it remained and was only finally pulled down in 1863.

If Bridewell disappeared, yet there is one great institution with which the name of Edward VI. is indelibly associated, and the more appropriately, since, by his munificence in this instance, he, the boy king, was providing for the education and maintenance of less fortunate youths. As has already been seen, a school had been founded in the former house of the Franciscans at Newgate for the benefit of fatherless boys and others in difficult circumstances. This institution was given the name of Christ's Hospital, though commonly called the "Blue Coat School," from the costume worn by the boys, which consisted of a dark-blue coat or gown, a red leather belt, bright yellow stockings, and a clergyman's band around the neck. With this attire, already sufficiently grotesque, a yellow petticoat was formerly worn, but the use of this singular piece of male attire has been recently discontinued. The flat cap of black woollen yarn, about the size of a saucer, and which comprised the accompanying headgear, was also dropped some years ago.

This famous institution is one of the most interesting in London. The buildings suffered greatly in the great fire of 1666, and became almost hopelessly dilapidated, when Sir John Frederick in 1680 undertook the benevolent task of rebuilding them at his own expense. Another great benefactor of the institution was Sir Robert Clayton, and the record of his benevolence is to be seen in the inscription below the statue of Edward VI., at the entrance gate. In 1803 the buildings were most extensively repaired and renovated, large contributions being forthcoming from the corporation and the livery companies. It was twenty years, however, before work was commenced, and it was only on April 28, 1825, that the Duke of York laid the corner-stone of the new hall, which was erected from designs of John Shaw, the architect of the infirmary, which had been put up some years before, and the new hall was formally opened on May 29, 1829. It is one hundred and eighty-seven feet long, fifty-one feet wide, and forty-seven high, being thus thirty-four feet longer than Guildhall and fifty-one feet shorter than Westminster Hall. The building is perpendicular in style. A large playground, on the site of the old Giltspur Street Compter, was added in 1868-'69. The hall well merits a visit. At its upper end is a large picture of Edward VI., granting the charter of incorporation to the hospital. There is also a large picture of James II., seated on his throne, surrounded by courtiers, receiving some of the

mathematical pupils on the occasion of their honor day. This custom is still kept up, and annually said pupils are presented to the sovereign. Another picture represents Charles II. There are, besides, full-length portraits of Queen Victoria and the prince consort. The mathematical school was founded by Charles II. in 1672. A new mathematical and grammar school, with drawing school above and dormitories, was erected in 1832, and a large entrance in Newgate Street was opened. The two principal classes in the school are called "Grecians" and "Deputy Grecians." The forms below are called the "Great Erasmus" and the "Little Erasmus." It is in the great hall that the annual exercises are held. These formerly took place on St. Matthew's day, but now occur on the July breaking up. On these occasions the so-called "Grecians," or head boys, deliver a number of orations before the lord mayor, the corporation of the city, the board of governors, and assembled guests, who as a rule include a large number of distinguished personages.

It was not only the organization of charities which was made the object of a special effort, but also certain very essential civic reforms. Thus, the escape of criminals from the city over London Bridge to Southwark had become a notorious outrage. The independence of that borough had long been a cause of great annoyance to the civic authorities, and they finally obtained from Edward VI. concessions whereby they could prevent and control this escape of malefactors.

It was not, however, until 1550 that the authorities of the city obtained a complete control over Southwark. A royal charter, dated April 23, in that year granted to the "commonalty" of London the "manor" of Southwark and all the manorial rights thereunto annexed, with both civil and criminal jurisdiction. On receiving the charter the court of aldermen elected one more to their own number, and thus was Southwark, which had in Roman days been second probably not even to London in importance, brought into the boundaries of the city, and transformed into a ward, to which was given the name of Bridge Ward Without. That Southwark was in Roman and Anglo-Saxon days a place of considerable importance is proved by the remains which have been disinterred in recent excavations, and the limits of the then fortified enclosure are determinable, as in the city itself, by the situation of the places of interment, which were always just beyond the line of the fortifications. It does not appear by name or otherwise in any Saxon charter, but its name shows that the walls existed in Saxon times, and they were probably highly useful in protecting the bridge during the war of the Danish invasion. These walls were in all probability destroyed during the conquest, and Southwark remained therefore a very inconsiderable place for many centuries, though it sent members to Parliament as early as 1265, and is in fact mentioned as having two members in 1298 and 1300 and later years.

The death of Edward VI. occurred, as we have seen, at Greenwich on July 6, 1553; but, though Henry VIII. had endeavored to secure the peaceful succession to the throne by causing to be repealed the act of Parliament whereby the illegitimacy of his two daughters, the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth, was affirmed, and by causing a new act to be passed whereby their legitimacy was established, yet Mary did not obtain her rights without a struggle, and, as usual, London was the theatre of the principal operations. The consequences which followed the attempt made by John Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, who had succeeded to the aims and ambitions of the Protector Somerset, to place his daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Dudley, usually spoken of by her maiden name as Lady Jane Grey, on the throne, threw the whole city into great confusion. The unfortunate girl had not a shadow of claim to the crown, though the pretensions advanced for her were based on the fact that her mother Frances, Marchioness of Dorset, was the daughter of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, and of the Princess Mary, second daughter of Henry VII. The whole conspiracy was intended merely to further the ambitions of her father-in-law, who had, only two months before Edward's death, secured her marriage to his fourth son, Guilford Dudley. The wedding had taken place at Durham House, the London residence of the Dudleys, and had been made an occasion of much pomp

and circumstance. These daring intrigues, which resulted so disastrously for all concerned, gave to that grim fortress, the Tower of London, the most tragic page in its history.

The events by which Lady Jane Dudley was dragged from the comparative tranquillity and seclusion of private life into the brilliant glare of public and political life, her proclamation as queen with all the pomp and solemnity of such occasions, and the subsequent developments of the conspiracy, are too well known to require any lengthy recital here. Mary made her solemn entry into London on August 3, 1553, and was received with joy and acclamations by all classes of the people. The Duke of Northumberland was arrested and committed to the Tower, as were also the Duke of Suffolk, Lord Guilford Dudley, and his unfortunate wife, the victim of the whole affair. They were tried for high treason, and condemned to the scaffold. The Duke of Northumberland was executed on August 22 of the same year. The Duke of Suffolk was pardoned, but his implication in the Wyatt Rebellion, organized as a protest against the queen's marriage with Philip of Spain, proved fatal, and he was executed on Tower Hill on February 23, 1554; the Lady Jane Grey and her husband, Lord Guilford Dudley, having met a similar fate on the February 12 preceding. The spot where the tragedy was enacted is still reverently shown to visitors at the Tower.

Meanwhile the queen had worked earnestly to restore the religious status of the nation, and incurred the opprobrious appellation of "Bloody Mary" from the zeal with which she endeavored to extirpate schism and heresy. It was but natural, however, that such men as Cranmer, Holgate, Coverdale, Ridley and Hooper, whom she conceived to have been false to every trust, both in Church and in State, should be brought before the bar of justice and punished according to their deserts. But her greatest imprudence and mistake was her marriage with Philip II. of Spain. This union was in every way most ill advised. The king of Spain landed at Southampton on July 20, 1554, and his marriage to the queen was celebrated with due pomp and solemnity a few days later at Winchester. On November 20 following Cardinal Pole arrived in England as legate, and was immediately received with great honor, the king and queen advancing to meet him with much ceremony. London was now the scene of a very grand proceeding. Parliament was assembled, and the Pope's legate invited the Lords and the Commons to reconcile themselves with the Holy See, from which error had so long estranged them. His message was received with much satisfaction, and both houses voted an address expressive of their sorrow at what had occurred in the past, with prayer for pardon, and promise of future loyalty. The Pope's legate, himself an English prince nearly allied to the royal family, then pro-

nounced a solemn absolution, whereby the Parliament and the kingdom were freed from all ecclesiastical censure, and were received back into the bosom of the Church. The old ceremonies and processions were now fully re-established, and the mayor and aldermen, in their robes of office, formed again one of the principal features of the procession about St. Paul's. Te Deums were sung in all the churches, and bonfires were lighted at night throughout the city.

But all this did not have the effect which was desired and expected. There were those, however, who strongly opposed the doctrine of Papal Supremacy, and were entirely in sympathy with the new state of things, so that the queen and the parliament, who conceived it their sacred duty to inaugurate measures of repression and discipline, came naturally into much disfavor. The queen had long been in a very suffering state of health, and the problems and difficulties of her position greatly increased her distress. Apprehensive for the future of the Church in England, distressed by the absence of her husband, who, finding his authority very limited in England, preferred a residence on the continent, dismayed by her own barrenness, and dejected by the loss of Calais and the reverses of English armies in France, the unfortunate princess succumbed to a lingering illness, and died at St. James' Palace—where she had taken up her residence, preferring it to Whitehall, which was too much associated with Anne Boleyn and her mother's

sufferings—on November 17, 1558. The same day Cardinal Pole died at Lambeth Palace, whither he had taken up his residence on succeeding Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The news of Mary's death reached Elizabeth at Hatfield, and as soon as she could possibly convene a suitable court and retinue she proceeded to London, into which city she made a solemn entry on November 24 following. The route of the royal procession was brilliantly decorated, and lined by thousands of spectators. The queen was met at Highgate by the lord mayor, the aldermen and other civic officials, and conducted to the Charter House, where she appears to have remained until her coronation. This ceremony was for a time delayed, owing to the difficulty which she experienced in finding a bishop who was willing to consecrate and crown her. But Elizabeth was not to be easily discouraged, and she finally succeeded in her quest, for Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, was at last induced to officiate on the occasion.

The procession from the Tower was of exceptional splendor, and took place, as now had become the custom, on the day previous to the coronation—that is, on January 13, 1559. The queen left the Tower, where she had spent the preceding night, according to ancient usage, at two o'clock in the afternoon. The streets were splendidly decorated, and the queen was attended by a brilliant retinue, or, to use the ancient language, "honorably accompanied" by the "nobility

of the realm," the barons and other gentlemen, and with a notable "trayne of goodlye and beautifull ladies all richlye appointed." The whole pageant was, in fact, organized on a scale of exceeding magnificence, and the pompous habits of the age, in which the citizens of London vied with each other in the most costly shows, were illustrated to their fullest extent on this occasion. Indeed it would seem as if the great civic pageants here attained their culminating point, and as if from this occasion they began to subside—at least in most of their old-fashioned and quaint peculiarities—until their existence itself faded gradually away. On this occasion, however, the procession was compelled to halt that the queen might admire particular displays erected by the city or the livery companies. Thus, on the corner, at Fenchurch, a scaffolding richly decorated had been put up, whereon stood a band. Here the queen's chariot was stopped, in order that a small boy, in costly apparel, might welcome her in the name of the city. When the ceremony was concluded the queen proceeded on her way until the upper end of Gracious Street had been reached. There, before the sign of "The Eagle," the city had caused to be built a splendid arch. A stage had also been erected, which extended from one side of the street to the other. It was lavishly ornamented with battlements, and contained three archways, over the middle one of which there were three projecting stages, or elevated platforms. On these

were figures of Henry VII. and Elizabeth, his wife, seated on thrones and clad in robes of state—the former, being heir of the house of Lancaster, issuing, as it were, from a red rose, while the latter, being the heiress of the house of York, issuing, as it were, from a white rose. Two branches, which were arranged so as to start from these roses, met at the second staging, and these were entwined so as to make a seat for a life-size figure of Henry VIII., also splendidly apparelled. By his side was a figure of Anne Boleyn, also in royal attire; and again from these seats started two branches, which, uniting, formed a seat for a large figure of the queen herself, sumptuously arrayed, crowned and sceptred.

Elizabeth, it is related, stopped and viewed this strange exhibit. Here again she had to submit patiently to an address in verse, delivered by a small child, after listening to which, and thanking the city for their courtesy, the royal procession moved on to Cornhill. Here arches had been erected, and other exhibits had been contrived, and included allegorical figures of Religion, Love, Wisdom, Justice and other virtues, which it was thus delicately insinuated were possessed by Elizabeth herself. Another child here delivered another oration, and the procession continued. At the conduit of the Cheap, on the corner of Soapers' Lane, an exhibit consisting of figures of the eight beatitudes was viewed by the queen. At Little Conduit Street a colossal figure of Time domi-

nated the scene. At St. Peter's on the Cheap another child, gorgeously dressed up, solemnly presented her with a Bible. Everywhere, and from every window, depended rich and costly banners, with streamers, and at the end of the Cheap, Ranulph Cholmeley, the city recorder, presented the queen with a fine red satin purse, embroidered with gold, and containing one thousand marks in gold.

At St. Paul's churchyard Elizabeth was obliged to submit to another oration, this time very lengthy and in Latin, delivered by a pupil of St. Paul's School selected by the head master thereof. The fifth and last pageant had been erected at "the Conduit," in Fleet Street. It consisted of a species of platform, in the shape of a castle, with four towers, upon which was erected a throne, behind which had been placed a tree. The figure of a woman was seated enthroned on this chair, crowned and sceptred, and over the figure was the inscription, "Deborah, the judge and restorer of the house of Israel"—this another delicate allusion to Elizabeth. On other steps of the platform were figures, also richly apparelled, representing the nobility, the clergy and the commonalty. Another child here delivered a "tremendous" oration. This calamity accomplished, the procession proceeded slowly towards Westminster, where, on the day following, the coronation took place. The latter ceremony was conducted with hitherto unexampled splendor, and was more brilliant in its details and

elaboration than any preceding occasion of a similar kind.

Elizabeth had found her strongest support in the city, and she was very careful therefore to appease any fears as to her right policy which might have arisen in the bosom of the citizens. With a magnanimity truly laudable, or a prudence really extraordinary, she buried in oblivion all offences, and received with graciousness even those who had at first taken the most decided stand against her. She was also very careful not to alarm the Catholic party, and though exhibiting from the first a very decided preference for the Protestant faction, yet she retained a number of her sister's councillors, but added some, who were well known to be strongly partisan, of the so-called reform movement. Thus Sir Nicholas Brown was created lord keeper, and Sir William Cecil secretary of state. So skillful and daring was Elizabeth in her political craft that, notwithstanding several outbreaks of the old Tudor temper and violence, she succeeded marvellously in retaining her popularity, even among contending factions. The city stood by her, and never forgot that her father had once held office as a mayor. There was, however, a strong opposition party among the Catholics, led by Sir Thomas White, the eminent founder of St. John's College, who had held the mayoralty at the time of the execution of Lady Jane Dudley; but the rigorous enforcement of the laws against heresy during the

previous reign had turned the tide of public opinion, always fickle and changeable, towards the anti-Catholic side. Later on, the excessive zeal of the Puritans, under Charles I., had the reverse effect, and popular feeling was turned distinctly in the opposite direction. London was always the scene of these excitements, and from the accession of Elizabeth to the death of Cromwell the city was the theatre of a religious as well as a civic drama, and it may truly be said that the religious feeling prevailed over and ran higher than any political or civic sentiment.

Under Elizabeth a new direction and impulse was given to English commerce, because of the great extension in England's naval power. The formation of new livery companies still continued. The Girdlers obtained from her in 1568 a confirmation of their charter. The same year she granted a charter to the Bricklayers; in 1571 one to the Joiners, and in 1580 the Painter-Stainers obtained from her the grant of a charter, while the same year she accorded to one James Verselyn, a Venetian, who had opened a glass-house near Blackfriars for making Venetian glass, a privilege under her great seal. Trade with Flanders had, it is true, flagged, after the Duke of Alva's subjection of the Low Countries, but it soon sought other directions and fields of energy. The merchants and large exporters and importers formed companies, after the manner of the craftsmen's guilds, and obtained royal charters for the same. It is true that a

elaboration than any preceding occasion of a similar kind.

Elizabeth had found her strongest support in the

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

“so-called company of merchant adventurers” had obtained a charter from Henry VII., but it was from Elizabeth that the Turkey Company in 1579 and the East India Company in 1600 obtained their charters.

The opening of the Royal Exchange, which had been organized after the pattern of the Antwerp Bourse, on January 23, 1570, gave a new departure to commercial affairs, and while some of the ancient traditions of the old guild merchant were unconsciously and accidentally revived by it, it in fact created a whole new system of business relations. The Exchange was installed in a building erected for the purpose by Sir Thomas Gresham on the same site as that occupied by the present building. Gresham had previously opened a bank at the sign of “the Grasshopper,” in Lombard Street, and was thus one of the first of “the Goldsmiths” to become a banker. The opening of the Exchange, which was performed by Queen Elizabeth in person, was made the occasion of great display. The queen, who was at the time residing at Somerset House, in the Strand, entered the city by Temple Bar, passing through Fleet Street and the Cheap, and so on by the north side of the Exchange through Threadneedle Street to the house of Sir Thomas Gresham, in Bishopsgate Street, where she honored him by her presence at dinner. After dinner the party proceeded with much state to the Exchange, which was then formally declared open, a herald with trumpet proclaiming it the Royal Exchange.

Temple Bar, Removed 1878

The architect was the Flemish Henryke, and the materials themselves which had been used in the construction had been brought from Flanders. In general design the building was not unlike that one from which it had been copied in more ways than one, the Bourse at Antwerp, a quadrangle, with a cloister running round the interior, and a "paun" or pathwalk above, with other chambers near to the roof. On the Cornhill side there stood the bell-tower, and on the north a tall Corinthian column, each of which was surmounted by a huge stone grasshopper, the crest of the Greshams. Niches in the quadrangle, immediately over the covered walk, contained statues of English kings and queens, from Edward the Confessor to Elizabeth herself. The whole structure was destroyed by the great fire in 1666, and another building, almost identical in style, was erected on the site. This second edifice was designed by Edward Jarman, the city surveyor. This one was also destroyed by fire, on January 10, 1838, and the present building erected. On each occasion the only statue to escape uninjured was that of the founder himself, and while kings and queens lay shattered off their pedestals, Gresham, from his, viewed the scene of disaster with what may truly be said to be a stony, but complacent stare.

About coeval with the foundation of the Royal Exchange another no less interesting initiative was taken this being the setting aside for the "college"

or "common house" for the doctors of the civil law, and the study and practice of the same, of a large mansion on St. Benet's Hill, to the south of St. Paul's churchyard, having frontings on Knightrider Street. The property had been leased in reversion by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's to one John Incent, a "gentleman proctor of the archers and chapter clerk of the tenements of St. Erkenwald," and was purchased in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign for the purpose before described by one "Master Henry Harvey," doctor of civil and of canon law, master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and prebendary and dean of the archers. Before this time the civilians and canonists had been lodged most meanly in Paternoster Row, which lodging, after their removal to their new quarters, became the tavern of the Queen's Head. The house, which came soon to be known as "Doctors' Commons," was destroyed in the great fire of 1666, but soon re-erected. It was a building of red brick, with stone coigns and dressings, having its principal front on Knightrider Street, and was built around two quadrangles. It contained, besides the large hall for the hearing of cases, a dining hall, library, other public apartments and doctors' chambers. Doctors' Commons comprised five courts, of which three appertained to the archdiocese of Canterbury, one to the diocese of London, and one to the lord commissioners of the Admiralty. First came the Court of Arches, which was that of

the archbishop; secondly, the Prerogative Court, where wills and testaments were proved and letters of administration taken out; thirdly, the Court of Faculties and Dispensations; fourthly, the Consistory Court of the Bishop of London; and, fifthly, the High Court of Admiralty. The recent readjustment and alteration made in the Courts of Law, and the removal of all the courts to the New Law Court Buildings, led to the dissolution of Doctors' Commons, the library and portraits being sold in 1862, and the building itself cleared away in 1867. A part of Queen Victoria Street, that modern thoroughfare, now passes over what was formerly the peaceful gardens of the learned canonists.

As we have said, the day of Flanders' commercial grandeur and prosperity was over. Spanish rule, never very happy in its methods, had even in those days proved disastrous to trade, and had a very unfortunate effect on the commercial conditions of the Netherlands. What was Flanders' loss, however, was London's gain. The markets of the city took unto themselves a distinctly cosmopolitan character, as well for the great divergence in the nationalities of their frequenters as to the variety of their exhibited wares; for there the gold and sugar of the New World were found, side by side with the silks and cottons of India, and the woollen stuffs having England as their place of manufacture. So great was the assistance which the vigorous commercial policy of Elizabeth

afforded, that a statue of the queen was erected in the Exchange by subscription as a tribute to her far-seeing wisdom and sagacity. It was not only in her commercial policy that Elizabeth showed herself a shrewd and admirable business woman, but also in the punctual payment of all crown debts, the abolition of benevolences and all illegal exactions, the reform of coinage, and the correction of the abuses in taxation. All this greatly endeared the queen to the city, and, had she been inclined to warlike occupations, she would have found prompt response in all directions; men, money, ships, all would have been speedily forthcoming.

While Elizabeth was thus prosperous and happy a great tragedy, in which she and her country were deeply concerned, was unrolling itself in the life of a sister queen. The story of Mary, Queen of Scots, can only be connected with our subject in a secondary manner, yet, while having no direct bearing on the history of London, her life is so interwoven with that of her rival, Elizabeth, and touches at so many points the interests of the city, that it is difficult to omit at least a passing mention of this unfortunate princess. The marriage of Mary, Queen of the Scots, to Henry Darnley, son of Matthew Stuart, Earl of Lenox, took place on July 29, 1565. The marriage seemed in every way appropriate, as his mother was the Lady Margaret Douglas, daughter of Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus, and of Mary Tudor, eldest

sister of Henry VIII. He was thus, after Mary herself, the next heir to the throne of England. This in itself, however, was sufficient enough to alarm Elizabeth. The union of two, who were in the eyes of many regarded and recognized as having a better right to the throne of England than herself, was enough, indeed, to alarm its then occupant, for their issue would indisputably be the rightful and legitimate claimant to the English Crown. Thus did Mary incur, unwittingly, the everlasting displeasure of her rival, while simultaneously antagonizing the reform party in Scotland, who believed the family of Lenox inalienable adherents of the Catholic church. Inviting though the marriage therefore seemed, it was to be followed by developments which ultimately and rapidly led to the ruin of the unfortunate Mary. The discovery, which she was not long in making, in regard to the defective mental qualities of her husband, the disappointment occasioned by such discovery, the repugnance consequent upon the same, the advent of the accomplished Rizzio, the suspicions of her husband, the assassination of the unfortunate Italian, the gunpowder catastrophe, in which Darnley lost his life, her marriage with the Earl of Bothwell under such extraordinarily suspicious circumstances, all followed each other in rapid succession and hastened Mary to her doom.

The events which followed are equally well known, the indignation of the principal nobility for her weak-

ness, if not actual guilt, the meeting of the two armies at Carberry Hill, some six miles out of Edinburgh, and the subsequent defeat of the queen's troops, the imprisonment of Mary at Loch Leven, the battle of Langside, in which the queen's troops were again defeated, the flight of Bothwell to Denmark and that of the Queen of the Scots to England, to seek refuge in the hospitality of Elizabeth, all these events scarcely require recapitulation. With Mary on her hands, a guest and yet necessarily a prisoner, seeking help from Elizabeth as a sister sovereign, and yet denying the latter's right to have her tried by any tribunal, be it ever so distinguished; to which situation must be added political complications in France and Scotland, and the position of Elizabeth will be readily admitted to have been one of extreme difficulty. All know the unfortunate end of this celebrated affair. The Babington conspiracy, its discovery by Walsingham, the trial of the Queen of the Scots at Fotheringay, and, finally, her execution—all these events have been the theme of a vast literature. The discovery of the Babington conspiracy and the condemnation of the miserable Mary was celebrated in London with profusion and brilliancy. Tapestries were hung out of every window, bells were rung throughout the city, the poor were feasted at a splendid banquet, and bonfires were lighted at every corner. The queen wrote a letter to the mayor on the occasion, and, when the news came of the final tragedy

at Fotheringay on February 8, 1587—the execution of Mary—though Elizabeth assumed an attitude of great horror and surprise, yet the festivities and rejoicings were repeated.

Elizabeth now turned her attention to preparations for the repulse of the expedition which Philip II. of Spain was dispatching against England. These military and naval preparations were watched by the citizens of London with great interest. The queen had asked of the city assistance to the extent of fifteen ships and five thousand men. The city furnished her with thirty ships and ten thousand men, while ten thousand more were formed into volunteer companies, which drilled every night in the artillery grounds at Spital Fields. The famous review at Tilbury was attended by all London, and, when the news of the destruction of the Spanish Armada reached the city, a great Te Deum of thanksgiving was held at St. Paul's, which the queen attended in solemn state. This occurred on November 24, 1588. Seven years later, also in November, Fletcher, who had succeeded Aylmer, preached his sermon on Elizabeth herself and her virtues, and eight years later London witnessed the mournful but pompous and imposing pageant of her funeral procession, which accompanied her body from Richmond, where she died on March 24, 1603, to Westminster, where she was interred.

Such were the personal relations of Elizabeth and

the citizens that she was sincerely mourned by the city, more sincerely perhaps than any sovereign who had ever ruled the land since Edward the Confessor. Whatever may be thought of Elizabeth in her private character, and there is much difference of opinion on this point, high tribute must in justice be paid to her statesmanlike qualities and her undoubted ability in dealing with difficult problems and intricate political and social situations. Not only England, but London itself, had much for which to be grateful to her; for the city had enjoyed both calm and good government and commercial prosperity during her reign, disturbed perhaps principally by the fear of the invasion of the Spanish Armada and the conspiracy of Essex. That the first was promptly set at rest by the destruction of the Spanish fleet we have already seen. In the second instance the riots were as promptly quelled by the strong arm of Elizabeth, the earls were routed, and Essex and a number of his associates tried, condemned and executed, February 25, 1601. The reign of Elizabeth may in fact be said to have been one of glory and prosperity, and the foundation of the Royal Exchange to have been an epoch-making event in the history of commercial England. It is a somewhat curious fact, however, that while general prosperity so greatly increased and the mayor and aldermen were so largely engrossed with the regulation of public charities—the organization of which had been so completely disarranged by the depredations of

Henry VIII.—yet pauperism seems, on the other hand, to have so largely increased. That this should have led to a number of riots and brawls is not surprising, and the very year 1595, which witnessed such great rejoicings in honor of Elizabeth's long reign, the riots, in which the apprentices were not loth to join, had attained such proportions that it was with some difficulty, and only by measures of severe repression, that the mayor was enabled to put a stop to the troubles, and the matter was finally brought to a close by the trial at Guildhall of five unhappy wretches, who, condemned for sedition, were executed on Tower Hill.

Elizabeth herself, however, took the most active part in all reforms, and also greatly interested herself in the readjustment of public charities and other institutions. It was a part of her general policy of benevolence. It was not only hospitals and almshouses which called upon her attention, but she had a very keen appreciation of the importance of education, and as early in her reign as 1560 she had granted her patronage to the foundation of a large grammar school in Southwark, and other schools were later founded by her munificence and under her patronage. Her greatest achievement, however, in this direction was the founding in 1590 of Westminster School, officially known as St. Peter's College, a "publicke school for grammar, rethoricke, poetrie, and for the Latin and Greek languages." The school was at-

tached to the Collegiate Church of St. Peter at Westminster. There had been a school connected with the abbey as early as the fourteenth century, and the new school was founded, as it were, on the older foundations which had suffered annihilation at the time of the dissolution. The new school was to consist of a dean, twelve prebendaries, twelve almsmen and forty scholars, with a master and an usher; but a far greater number of masters and a much larger number of boys are now connected with the institution. The forty of the queen's foundation are called "queen's scholars," and after an examination, which takes place on the first Tuesday after Rogation Sunday, four are elected to Christ Church, Oxford, and four to Trinity College, Cambridge. To be placed on the foundation, boys must be over twelve and under thirteen years of age.

The boys "on the foundation" were formerly separated from the "town boys" when in the schoolroom by a bar and curtain, but this is no longer the case. The old schoolroom was, in fact, the former monastic dormitory of the days when the abbey was a monastic institution. Other buildings have been erected, however, and the old schoolroom is no longer used for the purpose. The college hall, originally the abbot's refectory, had been erected by Littleton, abbot of Westminster, in the reign of Edward III. The queen's scholars, however, still retain some of their ancient privileges; thus it is still their privilege to have seats provided for them at coronations and other royal

functions occurring in the abbey church, and this privilege was observed as recently as the jubilee ceremonies of 1887. In conformity with an old usage, the queen's scholars give a theatrical performance every year at Christmas, a play of Terence or Plautus being selected, and a Latin prologue and epilogue, new on each occasion. The Westminster boys were for many years held to outrage all decency by their rough behavior, but their manners mended greatly with the manners of the age. Among other eminent men who have been masters of this school have been Nicholas Udall, the author of "Roister Doister;" William Camden, the antiquary, and the renowned Dr. Richard Busby, whose name has been given to a certain popular game; while among those educated here who have risen to prominence have been Ben Jonson, George Herbert, Giles Fletcher, Jasper Mayne, William Cartwright, Abraham Cowley, John Dryden, Nathaniel Lee, Nicholas Rowe, Matthew Prior, William Cowper and Robert Southey; also Sir Harry Vane, the younger, Sir Christopher Wren, John Locke, Edward Gibbon and other distinguished men.

One year after the foundation of Westminster School by Elizabeth, that great company, the Merchant Tailors, determined also to assist the cause of education, and the consequence of this decision was the foundation of Merchant Tailors School, in Suffolk Lane, in the ward of Dowgate. To this end, it was decided to purchase the west gatehouse, courtyard,

galleries and part of the chapel, forming a portion of the so-called "Manor of the Rose," a house originally built by Sir John Poultney, knight, who had been five times lord mayor in the reign of Edward III. The property had subsequently and for many years been the residence of the De la Pole family, and had since then passed into the hands of the Duke of Buckingham. Sir Thomas White, who had then recently founded St. John's College, Oxford, and who was a member of the court of the Merchant Tailors Company, and one Richard Hills, some time master of the company, were those who contributed most largely towards the purchase of the building. The premises were completely destroyed during the great fire of 1666, and a new building—this one of brick, with pilasters, with a head master's house adjoining—was erected to replace the old school. When, however, the Charter House School was removed to Godalming, the Merchant Tailors, wishing to remove their school from a close and crowded locality, near London Bridge, in which it was situated, availed themselves of this opportunity to do so, and purchased the Charter House premises.

Not satisfied, however, with the buildings which they found there, they determined to erect a new school more in accordance with modern educational and sanitary ideas. The first stone was laid in June, 1873, by the late Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, then Duke of Edinburgh, and the building was formally

opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales on June 6, 1873. It occupies the northwest corner of Upper Green, and is a fine red brick and stone building, collegiate gothic in style, and containing a spacious entrance hall, a great hall on the first floor, a fine large schoolroom, fifty feet in length by thirty-two in breadth, a lecture theatre, classrooms and other apartments. In the great hall stands the statue of Sir Thomas White. A very handsome chimney-piece also deserves attention. The school is divided into an upper and a lower school. The curriculum includes Hebrew as well as classical literature, which is unusual, and, since 1829, modern languages as well. Boys are admitted at any age, if able to prove efficiency, but only those who entered below the third form are eligible for the university fellowships. They can only remain until the Monday after St. John the Baptist's Day preceding their nineteenth birthday. When that day comes, they must, whether their studies are completed or not, leave the institution. It is one of the old charter rules, but is still strictly adhered to. Presentations are in the gift of the members of the court of the Merchant Tailors Company.

The school enjoys thirty-seven out of the fifty fellowships at St. John's College, Oxford, founded by Sir Thomas White, besides eight so-called exhibitions at Oxford and six at Cambridge. St. Barnabas (June 11) is the day on which the election to these prefer-

ments takes place. This day is also a speech day, and the day on which the prizes are distributed. There is, however, another ceremonial day in December, which goes by the name of "Doctors' Day." Both are occasions of importance, and the audience always numbers the officers of the Merchant Tailors Company, and other distinguished personages. The boys of the school who have risen to eminence are too numerous to mention. Among the number, however, are Edmund Spenser, the great poet; Edwin Sandys, the traveller; James Shirley, the dramatist; Vicissimus Knox, the essayist; Charles Mathews, the comedian; Dr. Samuel Birch, the renowned Egyptologist; Dr. Francis Hawkins, the physician; twenty-one bishops of the Church of England, and other eminent divines, judges and prominent men.

But still another important educational institution had its inception in the days of Elizabeth. This institution was none other than Gresham College, named after Sir Thomas Gresham, to whom London owed the Royal Exchange, on condition that on the demise of his widow certain lectures on divinity, civil law, astronomy, music, geometry, rhetoric and physic should be delivered in his house, and that it should be retained and kept up for that purpose. Many distinguished men have been lecturers of that institution. These include no less a person than Sir Christopher Wren, who, in 1667, succeeded Dr. Rooke in the chair of astronomy, and Dr. Isaac Barrow, who succeeded

to the chair of geometry in 1662. The building seems to have escaped the great fire of 1666, for it is recorded that the Royal Exchange, having suffered destruction, the Exchange was temporarily held "at Gresham College." The place having ceased to meet the requirements, the present college was erected in 1843 from the designs of George Smith, Esquire—this one at the corner of Gresham and Basinghall Streets—and the first lecture in the new building was delivered on November 2 of that year. The lectures are now given in the evenings, instead of during the day, this being done to facilitate the attendance of clerks and other employees, the college having become a species of free night school. The lectures on music are especially popular, and, being illustrative as well as didactic, attract many music lovers.

But the reign of Elizabeth was not only remarkable for its political achievements and commercial successes, but also because it was an age notable for the greater distinction of brilliancy in the general tone of society; but, like the intellectual tone of society, the topographical position of the fashionable world had changed greatly under Elizabeth. It was only the morals which seem not to have altered. Society was moving westward, Tower Hill was now largely abandoned, and the Strand, which had been paved in 1532, was now bordered with splendid mansions. While it had long been highly favored by the clergy—a number of provincial bishops having Lon-

don residences on the Strand, with gardens sloping down to the edge of the Thames—it required the example given by Protector Somerset, when he started operations on his vast residence there, to give the proper impetus to the social migration. Elizabeth herself, who disliked St. James or Whitehall because of their associations, greatly affected the Strand, and spent much of her time at Somerset House, where she was residing at the time of her famous visit to the city to open the Royal Exchange. Here, on the Strand, was Arundel House, which gave its name to the present Arundel Street, in which splendid residence Thomas Seymour, lord high admiral and brother of the protector, held a veritable court, and gave sumptuous entertainments. Here also was Cecil House, the mansion of Sir William Cecil, the great Lord Burleigh, lord high treasurer, which stood on the north side of the Strand, on the site of the present Burleigh Street and the old Exeter Change, not far opposite from where Cecil Street now finds its way to the Thames. It is described as being a “verie fayre howse, rayased with bricke proportionable, adorned with four turrets placed at the four quarters of the howse,” while its interior is said to have been “curiouslye beautified with rare devises.” Adjoining was the house of Sir Robert Cecil, knight. At Cecil House, Lord Burleigh gave splendid entertainments, which were attended by the queen and court, civic magnates and other distinguished persons. There is

special mention made of a supper held here on July 14, 1561, which was graced by the presence of Elizabeth, and it is added that she drove thither "by the fields from Christ Church," from which we may conclude that what is now Covent Garden was then a wilderness.

On the Strand were also situated other fine mansions, including Paget House, the residence of William, first Lord Paget, and afterwards of his son Henry, second Lord Paget; and Russell House, the residence of the Earl of Bedford. The first Russell House was on the south side of the Strand, while the later mansion was situated on the north side of the street, and its large gardens, which extended far back of it to the neighborhood of Holborn, were the scene of many a festive gathering. On the site of the present Cecil Street and Salisbury Street, between the mansions of the Bishops of Worcester and Durham, stood Salisbury House, so named after Sir Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, who built it. The housewarming took place on December 6, 1602, though the house was scarcely finished, and was attended by Queen Elizabeth—probably one of the last functions at which she was ever present, as she died the following March. Lastly, but by no means leastly, mention must be made of Suffolk House, the residence of the Duke of Suffolk, and which stood even further west than Charing Cross, on the site which was afterwards occupied by Northampton House, and later still by

Northumberland House. Others had gone even further west, and Tothill Street, Westminster, and the neighboring streets had become a distinctly fashionable locality. Thus, while we find Lord Grey de Wilton, Lord Dacre and Sir George Carew living in Tothill Street, Canon Row contained the residences of the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Sussex, and that of Anne, Duchess of Somerset, mother of the Earl of Hereford.

It must not be supposed, however, that all of society had moved westward, for Finsbury was still quite the style and remained a favorite Sunday walk. The Marquis of Winchester had his house in Old Broad Street, on the site of the former house and gardens of the Augustinian Friars; Sir Thomas Gresham resided, as we have seen, not far distant, in Bishopsgate Street; while that extraordinary woman, Catherine, Duchess of Suffolk, held a species of *salon* at her house in the Barbican, right off Finsbury Circus, in which street was also situated the residence of the Spanish ambassador. Things seem indeed to have been distinctly scattered, for we find the Earl of Abergavenny living at Abergavenny House, in Ave Maria Lane, off St. Paul's churchyard; the Earl of Rutland inhabiting a house at Puddle Dock, at the foot of St. Andrew's Hill, near Upper Thames Street; Lord Keeper Bacon at Bacon House, Foster Lane, Cheapside; and Sir Christopher Hatton giving grand entertainments in Hatton House, Ely Place, Holborn.

It is not only the splendid mansions and the lavish entertaining which make the age of Elizabeth of so great an importance in the history of society; it is the illustrious names in philosophy, literature and adventure which give it a brilliancy peculiarly its own. The extensive voyages of Sir Walter Raleigh, of Drake, of Cavendish, and other eminent navigators, not only shed great lustre on her reign, but prepared the way for that colonization which has been and is one of the greatest sources of England's prosperity. While Bacon was giving to the world a new thought in his philosophy, Shakespeare, that immortal genius, was bringing the drama to its highest level, Spenser was adding harmonies to English poetry and Hooker beauties to English prose, Ascham was evolving his treatise on archery, Stow was completing his famous survey of London, Camden was immersed in his antiquarian studies, Cotton was founding his famous library, Ben Jonson was emulating the bard of Avon, and Marlowe, Beaumont and Fletcher were following this illustrious example.

The theatre, as well as the tavern, had now taken its place among the institutions of English social life. The first place of public entertainment, purposely constructed for theatrical performances, was known as "The Theatre," Holywell Lane, Shoreditch. The ground was described as "certain howsing and void grounds lying and being in Holywell, in the county of Middlesex," leased April 13, 1576, by one "Giles

Allein, of Haseleigh, in Essex, gentleman, to one James Burbage, late of London, joiner, for the period of twenty-one years." The house was erected at the cost of John Braynes, the father-in-law of Burbage, who advanced the money on condition that he should enjoy half the profits of the contemplated house. The opening of the playhouse, which is said to have occupied the exact site of the present Standard Theatre, seems to have been the signal for a series of commotions and riots among the people of the neighborhood, and an indictment was preferred against Braynes and Burbage during the reign of Elizabeth on account of the disorders due to the existence of their theatre. Nor does the venture seem to have been particularly successful, since we find that, after the death of Braynes, his widow was compelled to commence proceedings to enforce the fulfillment of the contract. Indeed, things went so far that it finally ended by Burbage's son, Cuthbert, causing the building to be demolished, and erected at Bankside, Southwark. This occurred in 1598, and the new theatre was then named the Globe, and became the summer theatre of Shakespeare and his fellows.

But Burbage, the father, seems to have been an enterprising man; for, not satisfied with his first venture, we find that, before the last event above recorded, he had purchased from Sir William More, of Loseley, a large portion of a house in the precincts of Blackfriars, formerly the property of Sir

Thomas Cawarden, master of the revels, and this Burbage transformed into a theatre. The deed is dated February 4, 1596, and the theatre, which came to be known as Blackfriars Theatre, was, it would appear, opened the following year. The theatre went through a series of vicissitudes, and passed into a number of different hands. In 1619 the city authorities ordered it closed, because of the petition of the neighbors, who complained of the "blocking up of the thoroughfare occasioned by the great resort of people." In 1629 a mixed company of French players performed here, and met with but a poor reception; and in 1635 it was leased by the Burbage heirs to one Henry Evans for the performances of the children of the chapel; and, after the departure of the children, the king's servants seem to have acted here. The theatre was closed a second time, when, under the ordinance of the Lords and Commons, September 2, 1642, all "public stage plays" were suppressed. A few years later, on August 5, 1655, the building was pulled down, and tenements erected on the site, part of which still retains the appellation of Playhouse Yard.

Holywell Lane, Shoreditch, seems, however, to have been a very favorite place for theatrical representations, for here was another famous playhouse which went by the name of "the Curtain," or, as originally spelled, "the Curtayne," from a piece of ground of that name which had formerly appertained to the priory of Halliwell, then dissolved. Another famous

playhouse of that day was the Fortune Theatre, which had been built for Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn, who here acted with their company of players. It stood on the east side of Golding, now Golden Lane, between it and what now bears the name of Upper Whitehouse Street, in the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate.

But if theatres entered upon their career of public utility during the reign of Elizabeth, the taverns were, if not at their zenith, yet far on in their ascendancy. The Mitre continued to be, and the Bull's Head, also in the Cheap, became immensely popular resorts. The former, as has already been said, stood at the corner of Bread Street, a little back from the street itself, being accessible also by a direct passageway in the rear. This famous drinking house is as celebrated perhaps for the allusions made to it in the writings of noted men and general literature, as it is for the celebrities who actually congregated there. It was destroyed during the great fire and not rebuilt. The Bull's Head also makes frequent appearances in literature, and was deservedly popular. It also had an entrance on Bread Street, and the present Bull Head Inn, at No. 3 Bread Street, is probably its direct successor. The Nag's Head, which stood also on the Cheap, at the corner of Friday Street, was distinguished from the adjoining houses by a nag's head in stone, which adorned the front of the house. It is here, in this famous tavern, that the fictitious consecration of the Elizabethan bishops is supposed to have occurred.

The taverns of West Cheap had, however, a potent rival in the Boar's Head, in East Cheap, which stood in what was known as Great East Cheap, between Small Alley and St. Michael's Lane, there being four taverns side by side in the block—the Chicken, nearest to St. Michael's Alley, the Boar's Head, the Plough and the Three Kings. The most famous, from the fact that it has been commemorated by Shakespeare, is the Boar's Head. The back windows looked out on the churchyard of St. Michael's, Crooked Lane. The statue of William IV. marks the site upon which it stood. Destroyed during the great fire of 1666, it was immediately rebuilt, the new building being of brick. The door was in the centre, and over it a window, over which again was a boar's head, cut in stone. On each side of the entrance was a wooden carving, in imitation of a vine branch, on the top of which was a diminutive Falstaff, in honor of him who is said to have been an habitu   thereof. The place grew dilapidated and became a gunsmith's shop, and was finally torn down; but the stone on which was the boar's head is now preserved in the museum of the Guildhall.

The south side of the river, which had acquired the name of Bankside, had become very popular as a resort among pleasure lovers. The Bankside proper was that strip of ground on the river bank, between what was called "Banksend," by Barclay's brewery, and "Bankend," by the Castle or Falcon, near Black-

friars Bridge. It boasted of a number of playhouses, of which we have already seen the Globe Theatre was one. It had also its full quota of taverns, of which the most famous was perhaps the Falcon, which was much frequented by Shakespeare and his friends. The Walnut Tree Tavern was not far away, in Tooley Street; but perhaps the greatest attraction was the Bear Garden, a "royal garden and amphitheatre for the exhibition of bear and bull baitings," a sport which, strange to say, remained a favorite amusement with the people of England up to the time of William and Mary. Indeed, it was considered quite the thing that the "*grand monde*" should be present at these performances, and royalty itself did not disdain to attend. It was one of the first things a new ambassador was taken to see; and it is related that here Elizabeth brought the Spanish ambassador, at the time that Europe was ringing with the first news of Drake's successes in the Pacific, in order, it is asserted, to find out from him, in the intervals of the sport, what Philip II. really thought in regard to the matter. Here at Bankside many prominent actors resided, including Kemp, Beaumont and Fletcher, Edward Shakespeare, William's younger brother, and Edward Alleyn, who became Henslowe's partner and succeeded him. All these, and others besides, resided there. It was, in fact, a species of London "Quartier Latin" during the Elizabethan period.

CHAPTER IX.

LONDON UNDER THE STUARTS.

Arrival of James I.—The Plague Detains Him at the Charter House—The Gunpowder Plot—The King's Wrangles with Parliament—The Proclamations Against Building—Last Changes in the City Precincts—Difficulties of the Apothecaries—The King's Threat of Moving—The Lord Mayor's Reply—Preachers Supplant Parish Rectors—The New Exchange—Foundation of the Charter House Hospital—Charles I.—His Trouble with the Parliament—The Spoliation of the Churches—The King's Visit to Guildhall—The Execution of Laud—The Army Council at Windsor—The King in London—The Trial at Westminster Hall—The Execution of Charles I.—The Dissolution of Parliament—Cromwell as Lord Protector—His Death—Changes in London—Foundation of Sion College—Lincoln's Inn Fields—Covent Garden—Inigo Jones—The Building of the Piazza—St. Paul's, Covent Garden—The Court at St. James—Making the Mall—Pall Mall—Birdcage Walk—Fashion Going Westward—Society in the City—The Earl of Northumberland at the Minories—Sir William Cockayne at Old Broad Street—Sir Paul Pindar in Bishopsgate Street—Aldersgate Street—Peter House—Thanet House—Lady Hatton and Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador, in Ely Place—Their Quarrels and Difficulties—Lady Hatton's Peculiar Parties—Brooke House in Holborn—Southampton House—Weld House in Lincoln's Inn Fields—Great Houses on the Strand—Exeter House—Dorset House—Bedford House—Northampton House—Suffolk House—Wallingford House, Whitehall—Berkshire House—St. James'—Fashion in Covent Garden—Clare House—Conde di Oniate, the Spanish Ambassador, in Long Acre—Leicester House, in

Leicester Fields—Tothill and Canon Row, Westminster—Anne, Countess of Dorset, in Dorset House—Popular Amusements—St. James' Fair—Cockfighting Licenses—The Cockpit at Whitehall—The Cockpit in Drury Lane Becomes the Phoenix Theatre—Other Theatres of the Early Stuart Period—Whitefriars Theatre—The Salisbury Court Theatre—The Dorset Gardens Theatre—The Hope Theatre, Bankside—The Taverns—Garraway's Coffee House, Change Alley—The Mermaid, in Bread Street, Cheap—The First Tea Room in London—Old Fish Street and its Public Houses—"La Belle Sauvage," in Ludgate Hill—The Story of the Queen of Sheba—The Legend of Pocahontas—Her Presentation at Court—Her Death at Gravesend—The Devil's Tavern, at Temple Bar—Jonson's "Leges Conviviales"—Sale of the Duchess of Richmond's Jewels—The Swan, at Charing Cross—The Blue Boar, in Holborn—Taylor's Tavern—Wills Coffee House, in Covent Garden—Dryden's Court and Coterie—Taverns in Westminster—The Rota Club, at the Turk's Head—Suburban Inns—The Angel, at Islington—Dangers of the High Roads—The Elephant and Castle—The Legend of the Infanta del Castillo—The King's Spring Gardens at Whitehall—First Opening of Vauxhall at Lambeth—Piccadilly—Piccadilly Hall—Shaver's Hall—Street Scenes in the Early Stuart Days—The First Hackney Coaches at the Maypole, in the Strand—Illustrious Names of the Early Stuart Period.

THE crown was never transmitted with greater tranquillity than when it passed from Elizabeth to James I. Elizabeth died at Richmond, as we have seen, on March 24, 1603, at two in the morning. At ten o'clock the same day Sir Robert Peel proclaimed James King of England, in the presence of some of the chief nobility of the kingdom. The whole country seemed united in greeting the King of the Scots as the legitimate heir to the throne, and

received him with every mark of rejoicing and respect. Nor was London backward in its manifestations of joy and pleasure. Hardly had the popular lamentation over Elizabeth subsided before Robert Lee, then lord mayor, caused the heralds to proclaim on the Cheap and other usual places the accession of her successor. James, like Elizabeth, appreciated most highly the importance of the city's loyalty, and wrote at once to thank the lord mayor for his promptness in acknowledging him as the new sovereign. The king started from Edinburgh on April 5, to take possession of the throne. At Waltham he was met by one of the city's sheriffs, the other being ill, and, when he arrived some days later at the gates of London, he was met by the lord mayor in person, the aldermen and other civic officials, who greeted him in the name of the city. The plague was, however, raging with great virulence, and James prudently refrained from entering London, and determined to take up his residence at the Charter House, outside of the city, and to defer his state entry until the pestilence should have subsided. The epidemic, however, continued with great violence, and it is computed that thousands of people died of the dread disease during the year. James thought, and that wisely, that it was imperative that some measures should be taken to allay the course of the scourge. It was therefore enacted that no houses should be built in the suburbs, that the theatres should be closed, and that the hold-

Hampton Court Palace

had already impaired it, and it was additionally damaged by his marked favoritism for Robert Carr and George Villiers. He created the former Earl of Somerset and the latter Duke of Buckingham, granted to each in succession his most intimate confidence, and conferred upon them the highest honors in the State, and by so doing greatly aroused the jealousy and anger of those who, being older peers of the realm, deemed themselves more eligible to such offices. In the two new creations James, however, followed a well-determined policy. The number of members of the Upper House was much diminished, for the wholesale executions of the preceding reigns had greatly depleted its ranks, and their jealous policy had so lessened its influence as to render it completely subordinate to the Commons. James felt that, of its remaining members, the older peers owed nothing to him or to his house, and that, to counterbalance the power of the Commons, a new and augmented nobility was necessary. This measure naturally met with much opposition from the already existing peers, who felt that the dignity of their rank was being cheapened by the multiplication *ad infinitum* of the numbers of their order. Already, in 1611, James had, by the creation of the Order of Baronets—the recipients of which new honor were to help financially in the king's scheme for the regeneration and civilization of the Irish by colonization from England—greatly antagonized and irritated the peers, who saw their prerogatives

encroached upon and threatened by a new degree in the scale of rank ; nor had the negotiations which James had entered into for the marriage of his son to a Spanish Infanta met in any way with public approval, while the execution of Raleigh on his return from Guiana, which execution took place on October 29, 1618, added another to the long list of tragedies which had Whitehall as their stage, and greatly increased the gloom of the times. General dissatisfaction existed also throughout the land, because of the king's inactivity in the matter of helping the Elector Palatine, his son-in-law, to secure the crown of Bohemia and defend the Palatinate. The king's method of replenishing the peerage was that measure, however, which was calculated to cause the most bitter dissatisfaction among the natural supporters of the crown, and the Upper House, in 1621, finally solemnly protested against the making of such a multitude of Scotch and Irish lords ; nor did the king's continued quarrel with the Commons enhance his prestige in that direction. Indeed, in all his measures James seemed to have been most unfortunate, and the alliances which he formed were all founded on a system of enmity to the Imperial House. But the end was not far distant. Early in the spring of 1625 James was seized with the tertian ague, and, after several fits, expired on March 27 of that year, after a reign in England of twenty-two years and in the fifty-ninth year of his age.

The civic events of the first years of James' reign have already been enumerated, but what is especially remarkable are the continued proclamations issued against the increase of building, more especially in the suburbs, and one would have supposed that the extension of the city's suburbs would have been regarded as a safeguard against the constantly recurring visitation of the plague; but this does not seem to have been taken into consideration, and the prohibitory proclamations followed each other in close succession. They certainly prevented the development of the suburban districts, but they operated in a way which was perhaps unforeseen, for their effect was to drive settlers to remote villages, such as were then Islington, Greenwich and Mary-le-Bourne (Marylebone). There were, however, two slight alterations in the city's boundaries during the reign just mentioned, and these were occasioned by the anomalous status of the sites of former monastic establishments. Thus, as far back as 1570, a contention had arisen as to the jurisdiction of the lord mayor over Ely Place, in Holborn, but the matter had been brought to a settlement by a recognition of that site as part of the city precincts. Thus James I., in his second charter, specifies those religious houses, the sites of which were thereafter to be regarded as within the city's boundaries. These included that of the dissolved priory of the Holy Trinity at Aldgate, St. Bartholomew's at Smithfield, Blackfriars in Castle Baynard

Ward, Whitefriars in Farringdon Without, and the minor liberty of Cold Herberge, commonly called Cold Harbor. Curiously enough, however, the inhabitants of these districts were exempt from certain taxes, and from the duty of holding certain civil offices.

Loyal as the city had seemed at the time of James' accession, yet the king and the city were not always on amicable terms. The king should certainly have been esteemed by the city companies, for his generosity in the matter of charters seems to have been almost without parallel, and no less than nine of the city companies owe their charters of incorporation to his munificence. Though not actually then incorporated, yet it was in 1603, just after the accession of James I., that the Fellow Porters organized themselves into a confraternity. In 1604 both the Turners and the Musicians obtained their charters; the following year the Curriers obtained theirs, and a year later witnessed the incorporation of the Fruiterers. In 1611 James granted a charter to the Plumbers, and in 1616 to the Scriveners Company. In 1620 the Bowyers secured their charter from the same source, and in 1623, just before his death, James granted a charter to the Gold and Silver Wire Drawers. But the charter which was the cause of the most discussion and unpleasantness was that granted in 1617 to the Apothecaries, whereby these latter were separated from the Grocers, with whom they had previously

been united. The separation was effected through the efforts of one Gideon de Laune, who held the post of apothecary to James I., and who obtained the much-desired severance and independence for the body of which he was a member. The charter itself expresses the desire of the Apothecaries to be dissociated from the Grocers, and states the reason for this wish to be because of "the ignorance and rashness of presumptuous empirics," and the necessity that "ignorant and unexpert men may be restrained," for by their conduct "many discommodities, inconveniences and perils do daily arise to the rude and incredulous people." The civic authorities seem, however, not to have approved of this arrangement, and to have refused to enroll the charter or recognize the Apothecaries in their new and independent character. No other charter, save that by which a century later the Surgeons were separated from the Barbers, ever caused such strife and dissension. Finally the king, who had by this time become seriously angered and affronted, wrote a letter to the lord mayor, in which, after stating that he had learned with great surprise and profound indignation that the charter which he had granted to the Apothecaries was as yet unenrolled, ordered its immediate recognition. Thus did the Apothecaries triumph.

The king's dissensions and difficulties with the city reached their climax on the attempt made by him to raise, by a "beneficence," the sum necessary to prose-

cure the war in defence of the Palatinate, and when
 he, having met with serious opposition from the city,
 threatened to remove himself and his court, and all
 the records of the Tower and the Courts of Justice
 at Westminster Hall, to another place, the lord
 mayor—then Sir Edward Barkham—after listening
 to the king until the end, calmly replied that he full
 well knew the king to have the power to carry out
 his threat, and that the city of London would humbly
 bow to the king's decision; his only request, made in
 his name and in that of his fellow-citizens, being that,
 in so general a moving, the king would deign to leave
 the river in its accustomed place. Nor was this the
 only indignity to which James I. was subjected at the
 hands of a lord mayor, for, on another occasion,
 George Bolles, at the time the occupant of the mayoral
 throne, went so far as to actually stop the king's car-
 riage while he was driving to divine service, in order
 that he (the mayor) might speak to him, at which the
 king was "bitterly enraged," and inquired "how
 many kings" there were in England besides himself.
 Nor was the king the only one to be affronted,
 for persons of more importance than the king
 were not less affronted: and on a personal de-
 sultor, had a feeling keenly
 commanded the

e court met with far
 their appearing in the
 occasion that illustrious
 ; the Spanish ambas-
 of it; and the king,
 eminent a guest, com-
 ir Martin Lumley, to

attend him at Guildhall, whither he went himself to reprimand the corporation and the citizens for so outrageous a behavior.

To the disquietudes occasioned by these unpleasantnesses must be added those religious controversies which still continued, during the whole of James' reign, to be debated in the city streets and in all places of private or public meeting, and the tendency of the times was strongly in favor of the Genevan doctrine. This came in a great measure from the apathy of the clergy who were incumbents of the city livings, and who seem to have held preaching to be no part of their duty. Prior to the English schism, preaching had naturally been limited to advisory exhortations, for, there being no opposition to the established creed, controversy had no cause for existence. After the schism they were practically silenced by the rigid enforcement of the power of licensing. Had they exerted themselves, however, during the reign of James I., and the first years of that of Charles I., the drift of affairs might have been greatly checked, if not prevented. As the rectors did not preach, others were appointed to do so, and these preachers, though Archbishop Laud made every effort to prevent it, gradually but surely took the place of the rectors themselves. Again, as the preacher's salaries were paid by the parishioners, they had to be allowed their choice in the matter of selection. The preaching seems to have been principa-

cute the war in defence of the Palatinate, and when he, having met with serious opposition from the city, threatened to remove himself and his court, and all the records of the Tower and the Courts of Justice at Westminster Hall, to another place, the lord mayor—then Sir Edward Barkham—after listening to the king until the end, calmly replied that he full well knew the king to have the power to carry out his threat, and that the city of London would humbly bow to the king's decision; his only request, made in his name and in that of his fellow-citizens, being that, in so general a moving, the king would deign to leave the river in its accustomed place. Nor was this the only indignity to which James I. was subjected at the hands of a lord mayor, for, on another occasion, George Bolles, at the time the occupant of the mayoral throne, went so far as to actually stop the king's carriage while he was driving to divine service, in order that he (the mayor) might speak to him, at which the king was "bitterly enraged," and inquired "how many kings" there were in England besides himself. Nor was the king the only one to be affronted, for persons connected with the court met with far more unpleasant experiences on their appearing in the city; and on a certain famous occasion that illustrious personage, the Count Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, had a most trying time of it; and the king, feeling keenly the slight on so eminent a guest, commanded the then lord mayor, Sir Martin Lumley, to

attend him at Guildhall, whither he went himself to reprimand the corporation and the citizens for so outrageous a behavior.

To the disquietudes occasioned by these unpleasantnesses must be added those religious controversies which still continued, during the whole of James' reign, to be debated in the city streets and in all places of private or public meeting, and the tendency of the times was strongly in favor of the Genevan doctrine. This came in a great measure from the apathy of the clergy who were incumbents of the city livings, and who seem to have held preaching to be no part of their duty. Prior to the English schism, preaching had naturally been limited to advisory exhortations, for, there being no opposition to the established creed, controversy had no cause for existence. After the schism they were practically silenced by the rigid enforcement of the power of licensing. Had they exerted themselves, however, during the reign of James I., and the first years of that of Charles I., the drift of affairs might have been greatly checked, if not prevented. As the rectors did not preach, others were appointed to do so, and these preachers, though Archbishop Laud made every effort to prevent it, gradually but surely took the place of the rectors themselves. Again, as the preacher's salaries were paid by the parishioners, they had to be allowed their choice in the matter of selection. The preaching seems to have been principally

on Tuesdays and Thursdays, though in the case of St. Margaret's (Lothbury), where Alexander Shepherd proposed preaching on the last-named days, the parishioners preferred Sunday afternoon and Thursday night. These sermons were often attended by violent demonstrations, and disorderly brawls not unfrequently followed the last words.

The reign of James I. was not prolific in its foundations or its monuments, yet there is one semi-public institution which had its inception during the period, and which merits especial mention. This institution was called the New Exchange. It stood on the south side of the Strand, on the site of what had been Durham House, facing what is now Bedford Street. Its frontage extended from Durham Street to George Court. It can best be described as a sort of arcade, in which were many shops on both sides, as well as above and below, and it became a place of great resort and trade for the nobility and the fashionable world, who congregated there in the mornings to do their shopping. The whole thing was given a sort of official status from the fact that the building, of which the first stone had been laid on June 10, 1608, was formally opened on April 11, 1609, in the presence of the king and the queen—a great honor in any case, and more unusual then than in our days, as the corner-stone habit was not then so prevalent among the royalty as it is to-day. The king, being asked to name the new edifice, called it Britain's

Bourse ; but the name did not stick to it, and it soon became generally known as the New Exchange. It was a number of years before the place became really popular, for London was then hardly large enough for more than one building of the kind, and the older merchants preferred that to which they were already accustomed. The New Exchange, however, became immensely popular at the Restoration, for Covent Garden had then become the fashionable locality, and it was therefore more suitable and conveniently situated than the one which Sir Thomas Gresham had founded on Cornhill.

The year 1611 witnessed the foundation, by one Thomas Sutton, of Camps Castle, in the county of Cambridge, philanthropist, of the afterwards famous Charter House Hospital. As it will be remembered, the Carthusian priory, which had originally stood on the site, and from which the name itself was derived, had suffered dissolution at the hands of Henry VIII., and the last prior, with four of his brethren, barbarously executed. In the division of the spoils which followed upon the dissolution of the religious houses, the Charter House was granted by Henry VIII. to Sir Thomas Audley, lord chancellor, by whom it was later sold to Sir Edward North, Baron North of Kirtling. Lord North, in turn, subsequently parted with it to John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, though, on the latter's execution and attainder, it reverted by a crown grant back to Lord North. It

will be remembered that on the accession of Elizabeth, she delayed her state entry into London for some days, until things could be prepared for her, and these she spent as Lord North's guest at his "house at the Charter House," where she held a council each day. On June 7, 1565, North again sold the house, this time to Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, and on the latter's execution and attainder, in 1572, it reverted to the crown. It was subsequently granted by Elizabeth to the duke's second son, Thomas, afterwards Earl of Suffolk, founder of Audley End, in Essex, and he sold it on May 9, 1611, to Thomas Sutton for the sum of thirteen thousand pounds; and on June 22 following Sutton endowed it as a charity, under the name of the "Hospital of King James." He died the next December, before the alterations had been completed or the place put in readiness, and was buried in the chapel.

The foundation comprised both a hospital and a school. The hospital was to house eighty pensioners, who were to be "gentlemen by descent and in poverty, soldiers that have borne arms by land or sea, merchants decayed by piracy or shipwreck," and other worthy paupers. The only restrictions enforced were the attendance in chapel, the wearing of a black livery gown, and the compulsion to dine in community in the great hall. The school was to accommodate forty boys, who "are not to be over fourteen or under ten when admitted." It was permitted that

the master of the school should also take in other pupils to the number of sixty, though not exceeding it. From these, but not from the foundation scholars, could fees be taken. The number of foundation scholars has been increased to sixty, while provision has been subsequently made whereby no less than three hundred scholars could be taken who are not on the foundation. In 1872 the school, which is one of the most famous in London, was removed to a new and handsome building, erected for the purpose at Goldalming, in Surrey. The Merchant Tailors, as we have seen, purchased the site and buildings on the removal of the Charter House School to its new quarters, and removed their own school, which had previously occupied a building near London Bridge, into the more commodious and sanitary and now vacated premises of its rival. The Charter House has numbered many eminent men among its masters, including Francis Beaumont, cousin of the dramatist; Sir Robert Dallington, the author of "Aphorisms," and others equally well known; while its scholars have included Sir William Blackstone, of "Commentary" fame; Joseph Addison and Sir Richard Steele; John Wesley, founder of the Methodists; Lord Ellenborough, Archbishop Sutton, Bishop Monk, Thomas Day, author of "Sanford and Merton"; Thackeray, Bishop Thirlwall, George Grote, the eminent Greek historian; General Sir Henry Havelock, Sir C. L. Eastlake, president of the Royal

Academy; and last, but not least, Major General Baden-Powell.

The accession of Charles I. was marked by a reappearance of the plague. An accident—the death of his elder brother, Henry, Prince of Wales—brought him into the direct succession. Another accident—the attendance at a court ball in Paris, while on his famous journey to Spain—betrothed him to his wife. The Spanish marriage not having been brought to a satisfactory issue, he espoused the Princess Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV., King of France, by proxy, the June previous to his father's death. On his accession he determined to complete his marriage as soon as possible. Buckingham was sent over to bring the princess to England, and the formal nuptials took place on May 27 following.

If the reign of Charles I. had been ushered in with the evil omen of the plague, such augur was not misleading, for the troubles of that unfortunate monarch commenced almost simultaneously with the meeting of his first Parliament. The last Parliament, which was dissolved on the death of James I., had brought its sessions to a close in a great state of excitement at the prospect of a war with Spain, and Charles very naturally supposed that the Commons would be unanimous in granting him supplies adequate to conducting a war which had apparently the approbation of the people. In this he was, however, disappointed. That body was now controlled by men of very advanced

views, who, unfavorable to the monarchy, were determined to seize every opportunity afforded by the king's necessities to embarrass the crown by those difficulties best calculated to deprive the royal office of its prerogative, prestige and power. Among these men, Sir Edward Coke, Sir Robert Philips, Sir Francis Seymour, Sir Dudley Digges, Sir John Elliott, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Mr. Selden and Mr. Pym were the most distinguished.

Their refusal of the king's demands compelled that monarch to dissolve Parliament. This occurred on August 12, 1626. With a second Parliament summoned by him the following February, Charles did not meet with any greater success. He found himself compelled therefore to resort to other means in order to raise the funds necessary to meet the expenses of the war with Spain, and issued a commission to levy customs, demanding at the same time the sum of one hundred thousand pounds from the city of London. The first measure, while it partially succeeded, caused the greatest dissatisfaction. The second measure absolutely failed, and the city, following the lead of the Parliament, refused the king's demand. The total lack of military distinction which was the most conspicuous feature of the Spanish campaign, to which may be added the complications which had arisen with France, added greatly to the king's embarrassment. Charles was himself reduced to summoning the attendance of the third Parliament; but, notwith-

standing the concessions which he promised, he again failed to obtain an affirmative vote to his demands. Never was sovereign placed in so difficult and unjust a position. Expected to prosecute a campaign to its finish—for the war with Spain, once undertaken, could not have been relinquished without loss of national prestige and kingly honor, and those who, by their blindness or obstinacy, embarrassed him the most would have been the first to cry out in loud protest had he done so—and yet denied the means wherewith to insure the success of the undertaking, there was nothing left for him to do but to resort again to extraordinary measures to raise the required funds. “Forced loans, benevolences, taxes without Parliamentary approval, martial law, and among its consequences arbitrary imprisonment and fines,” these were among the grievances of which the Commons complained, and yet they were the very measures which they themselves forced upon the king by their obstinacy and refusal to meet the king’s demands. As if to complete the sum of his miseries, the Commons now resolved themselves into a “Committee to consider the king and the state of the kingdom.” Pretending to no unusual privileges, they said, but merely claiming those powers which were the legacy of their predecessors, they finally drew up a formal petition, which they designated a “Petition of Rights,” whereby it was intended to imply that it contained no new claim or infringement of royal prerogative,

but only a corroboration, as it were, of those privileges obtained under the Magna Charta.

Though the king attended to their petition and granted all their demands, yet they persisted in refusing his requests, and proceeded as before. The situation was now getting from bad to worse. The assassination of Buckingham, the prorogation of Parliament, the revival of monopolies, the translation of Laud from the See of London to that of Canterbury, and the complications which followed; the refusal of the city to grant the ship money demanded of it, the abolition of the Episcopacy and the High Commission in Scotland, the summoning of the fourth or so-called "Short Parliament," and its abrupt dissolution by royal decree, all followed each other in rapid succession. The dispute concerning ritual had by this time reopened throughout Scotland, and the advance of the so-called "Covenanters" army into England was in itself enough to alarm the king. Charles therefore summoned a great council of peers at York, which was convened in September, 1640, and, foreseeing that they would advise him to call a Parliament, announced in his opening speech that he intended doing so. That Parliament, called the "Long Parliament," met on November 3 of the same year. The impeachment of the Earl of Strafford followed, and then came the act for abolishing "all images, altars, crucifixes," on January 23, 1641. Thus were all the churches and oratories of London despoiled again of their treasures

of art and piety. This was followed by the so-called "Committee of the Scandalous Ministers," a self-constituted body organized to investigate the alleged "scandalous conduct of the clergy." On May 12 following, at Tower Hill, the Earl of Strafford suffered the penalty of death for imaginary crimes. He was a martyr to his loyalty and his devotion to his king, and to his hearty support of Laud's ecclesiastical principles in defiance to the Episcopacy.

The same day that saw the king's assent to the execution of Strafford witnessed his sanction to the bill which took from him one of his last remaining prerogatives. This bill, whereby it was enacted that the Parliament should not be dissolved, prorogued or adjourned without its own consent, was carried rapidly through both houses. Another bill was passed abolishing the Court of the High Commission and Star Chamber, regulating the jurisdiction of the king's council and abridging its authority. The hopelessness of the king's journey to Scotland, followed by the insurrection in Ireland; the issuing of the "Remonstrance," which famous document was addressed to the English people by Parliament to explain and attempt to justify its course, without even so much as a pretence of its being addressed to the king—all these things gradually but surely led up to the civil war, the ominous roar of which was already audible in the distance. Open brawls between "Cavaliers" and "Roundheads" were now no unfrequent

sight in the streets of London, and the feeling against the Episcopacy ran so high in certain quarters that the bishops were prevented from attending Parliament, owing to the insults to which they were exposed.

The royal prestige was already so largely impaired that the king was powerless in the matter, and the failure of the king's visit to Parliament to seize the persons of Lord Kimbolton, Pym, Hampden, Hazelrig, Holles and Strode was additionally instrumental in undermining the royal authority, and the visit itself was profoundly resented by the Commons as a breach of their privileges; nor did the king's visit to the Guildhall on January 5, the day following, to demand that, if the members whom he sought took refuge in the city, the mayor and corporation should hand them over to his royal justice, in any way mend matters, while it considerably lessened the royal dignity. The House met again on January 11, but, after confirming the votes of the committee, immediately adjourned, on the ground that it was exposed to the greatest perils from the violence of its enemies. On the day appointed Pym, Hampden, Hazelrig and the other accused members were conducted by water to the House. The river presented a remarkable spectacle. It was covered with ships and a quantity of small craft, and on landing the party were received by a mounted escort, that had come from Buckinghamshire to testify their devotion to Hampden.

The king, apprehensive of danger, had retired to

Hampton Court the day previous, and to Windsor on January 12. His absence from London only tended, however, to aggravate matters. Petitions of the most seditious character were presented to Parliament, signed by merchants and other tradesmen. To increase the general alarm, the Commons, on the day after they had reassembled, January 12, reported to the Lords a pretended design to kill the Earl of Essex and four other peers; and two days later resolved that "all who had given the king evil counsel"—and this included all the king's advisers, legal or otherwise, who had happened to incur the displeasure of the Commons, and had thereby been the means of maintaining divisions between the king and Parliament—should be adjudged enemies of the State, and therefore guilty of high treason. In vain did the unfortunate Charles endeavor to allay the agitation, which, if not assumed, was certainly out of all proportion to the events. But all the king's concessions and assurances were met by the Commons with insolence and new demands. They did not cease tormenting the miserable monarch until he had conferred the governorship of the Tower on one of their own creatures, Sir John Conyers, in whom alone they claimed that they could repose confidence; and, failing in their endeavor to give even greater alarm to the people by a proclamation inciting them to a posture of defence against the pretended conspiracies of "papists and other ill-affected persons"—a motion

.

which the peers would not countenance or sanction—they determined to accomplish their ends by seizing at once the power of the sword, by means of the establishment of a militia, which would have as its officers creatures of their own. A bill was introduced to this effect, and passed both houses, which also purposed to restore the lieutenants of counties and their deputies to the powers from which they had been deprived, while for their conduct they were to be accountable in the future, not to the king, but only to the Parliament.

When this measure was presented to the king for his approval and signature, he was at Dover, attending the queen and his daughter Mary, Princess of Orange, on their embarkation for Holland. Being disposed to evade, rather than actively oppose the bill, the king travelled first to York, proceeding thence by slow stages to London. Everywhere Charles met with the most loyal welcome, the clergy, nobility and gentry hastening to express, either in person or by letter, their devotion and affection to his royal person. Encouraged by such support, the king recovered a certain degree of assurance, and issued proclamations complaining of the manifest usurpation by the Parliament of his royal prerogative, and the county of York levied a guard of six hundred men for his protection. This was immediately construed by the Commons as a breach of trust, and the forces which had been everywhere raised on pretence of service in

Ireland were now openly enlisted against the king, in whose name they had been raised. Such was the general excitement that on all sides quantities of plate and other valuables were put at the disposal of the Parliament as a means of raising the funds necessary to the maintenance of such an armament, and in London alone four thousand men were enlisted in one day. The queen, on the other hand, had, by the disposal of the crown jewels in Holland, been able to purchase a cargo of arms and ammunition, a part of which reached the king after many perils. Parliament now placed before the king the conditions under which it was willing to come to an agreement; but so ignominious were these that Charles felt that war on any terms was preferable to such a peace, so ignominious, and accordingly raised his standard at Nottingham on August 22, 1642, and the civil war thus began in earnest.

The king and the Parliament being now in open conflict, the people of England were driven to take sides with either the one or the other, and most violent animosities and bitter feuds were thereby engendered. The Episcopacy, the clergy, the nobility, and at least the greater portion of the gentry very naturally sided with the monarch, from whom they themselves derived their lustre, while London, the followers of the Presbyterian doctrine, the great corporations and the greater part of the citizens took the side of Parliament and adopted with zeal those democratic principles

on which the pretensions of that body were founded. It is hardly within the limits of this present work to enter in any detailed manner into the lamentable events which followed. They are, besides which, too well known to require any but the briefest recapitulation. The disasters of Edgehill, the momentary success of Brentford, when Charles, being more fortunate, was able to take prisoners some hundred of Essex's men ; the victory of Hopton Heath (March 19, 1643), counterbalanced by the taking of Reading by Essex (April 27); the great triumphs of Newcastle, in uniting Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland and the bishopric of Durham under the king's standard, and his taking of York, while the counties of Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Lincoln, Cambridge, Huntingdon and Hertford had been combined by Lord Grey of Wark against the king ; the success achieved by Sir Ralph Hopton, in securing Cornwall for the monarch, while Sir William Waller had united Winchester, Chichester, Hereford and Tewkesbury for the Parliament, succeeded in alternately raising and crushing the hopes of the Royalists, while the success of royal arms in the west, where the Marquis of Hertford succeeded in reducing Devonshire, and the defeat of Waller at Devizes (July 13, 1643); the surrender of Bristol to Prince Rupert (July 27) and the investment of Gloucester (August 10) had the effect of almost reducing Parliament to submission.

In London the friction between the two factions

foreboded dangerous developments. At the beginning of the summer a design had been formed for disarming the London militia and compelling Parliament to accept the king's conditions. It was unfortunate for the royal cause that the design was discovered, as discovery resulted in frustration, and the principals of the plot, who included Edmund Waller, the poet, and Tompkins, his brother-in-law, and Chaloner, his friend, were seized and the last two executed on gibbets before their own doors, Waller escaping by an abject submission and the payment of ten thousand pounds. The news having reached London as to the success of the royal armies in besieging Gloucester, Parliament seemed almost disposed to consent to a peace on conditions most favorable to the king; but the Puritans redoubled their energies and persuaded the Parliament to make every preparation for the relief of the besieged city. This was done, and Essex started with the army that had been furnished him for the scene of the conflict. What followed is well known to all. The battle of Newbury (September 10, 1643), with its attendant horrors and its undetermined end; the renewal of hostilities in the spring, the success of the Earl of Brentford near Banbury (June 29, 1644), the fatal termination of the battle of Marston Moor, in which Newcastle's regiments were so disastrously routed by the Cromwellian army (July 2, 1644); the second battle of Newbury (October 27, 1644), in which the Earl of Manchester com-

manded the Parliamentary forces—all these left the affairs of the nation in still the same undecided state.

But the Independents were, though in the minority, now to achieve a signal triumph in the passing of an act prohibiting members of either house from holding a civil or military appointment. This measure had practically the effect of barring all peers from being officers; but the command of the Parliamentary armies having been conferred on Sir Thomas Fairfax, the latter represented the services of Cromwell as indispensable, so that, notwithstanding the act and the fact that he occupied a seat in the lower house, his commission was renewed for a short period of time, and ultimately for the whole campaign, so that, though the supreme authority was nominally vested in Fairfax, it in reality devolved upon Cromwell. The conference between the king and the Parliament, which was opened at Uxbridge on January 30, 1645, resulted in nought and was fatal to the royal dignity, which should never have descended to a parley with a Parliament in open rebellion against the royal authority. Meanwhile the unfortunate Laud had been brought to the scaffold, and Tower Hill witnessed the execution of that prelate on January 10, 1645.

The campaign of 1645 had opened with some advantage to the Royalists, but the terrible disasters to the royal army at Naseby, followed by Prince

Rupert's capitulation of Bristol, seemed like a death knell to the monarchy. The king's affairs seemed now to be falling to pieces in every direction. The failure of the king's armies to relieve Chester and his subsequent flight to Newark and Oxford, where the royal army went into winter quarters, and more especially the great weakness which he showed in seeking passports from the Parliament to sue for peace, were all sure steps in his downfall. His flight from Oxford, where he had been during the winter of 1646, to the Scottish camp, where he arrived May 5 of the same year, and the delivery of his person to the commissioners of the Parliament (January 30, 1647), who conducted the illustrious prisoner to Holmby, were the next steps in the royal tragedy. But Charles was not to remain long at the latter place, for June 4 of that spring was the eventful day on which Joyce conducted the king to the now disaffected Parliamentary army at Triplow Heath, near Cambridge. This turn of affairs took the Parliament by surprise, and, finding that many of the disaffected officers were Cromwell's men, they determined to enter an accusation against him, and that he should be sent to the Tower. He, however, nipped their plan in the bud by joining the army and leading it towards London, and thus the capital became once more the scene of the conflict.

London had retained a strong attachment to Presbyterianism, and the Parliament felt that it could

entirely rely on its militia. It was thought better, however, to submit; but the army party, having succeeded in obtaining the arrest of eleven of the chief Presbyterian elders, did not think it well to force their way into the city, and so proceeded to Reading, taking the king with them. But so strange were the vacillating methods of those turbulent days, that the army, which only a few days before had been in direct antagonism with the Parliament, now became practically reconciled with that body and indeed its defender, and this was brought about in the most singular manner and by the very means which it would have been supposed would have prevented such a result. The Parliament had some time before, at the instance of and coerced by the army, passed a bill by which it was enacted that the militia of London should be changed, the Presbyterian commissioners displaced, and the command restored to those who had previously exercised it. The Londoners, however, opposed the bill and, proceeding to Parliament, demanded of it that it should reverse the vote just taken and coerced it into revoking the measure. The army, which had used much the same method of threat and violence to compel the enactment of the measure, now turned the tables and, expressing the opinion that the act of the Londoners was an infringement on the rights of the Parliament, took up the defence of the latter as against the people, so that the king found himself in the extraordinary position of

being nominally the head of an army which had one of his most determined enemies as its commander, and which was defending and protecting that very body against which he himself had only a few months before been waging the fiercest war.

Without experiencing the least resistance, the army entered the city and proceeded at once to Westminster. Seven peers were impeached, eleven members were expelled, the lord mayor, one sheriff and three aldermen sent to the Tower, several citizens and officers of the militia committed to prison, every deed of the Parliament from the beginning of the tumult annulled, and a solemn day of thanksgiving appointed for the restoration of Parliamentary liberty. The king had come with the army as far as Hampton Court, where he was living, to all outward appearance, with that dignity which befitted his rank, but he did not remain there long. Persuaded that his life was in imminent danger, he secretly left Hampton Court on the night of November 12, 1647—the same year which had seen his arrival there in August—and escaped to the Isle of Wight, where he sought the protection of Hammond, governor of the island, and was escorted by him to Carisbrooke Castle. Meanwhile Cromwell, being now entirely master of the Parliament and of the army, applied himself seriously to quell the disorders which existed throughout the kingdom; and, with this purpose in view, called a council of the chief officers of the army at Windsor to determine on the

settlement of the nation and the future disposition of the king's person. It was at this conference that first was made the daring proposition of bringing the king to trial, and it was determined to send or receive no more petitions to or from the king.

One more struggle remained to be made in the king's behalf, and this was to end in failure. Discontent among the Scotch, because of the disregard of the Covenant by the Parliament, resulted in the determination of the Duke of Hamilton to defend the king, and, having obtained from the Scottish Parliament a vote of forty thousand men, he entered into communication with the English Royalists, Sir Marmaduke Langdale and Sir Philip Musgrave, who had succeeded in raising considerable forces in the north of England. The English Royalists having, however, declined to accept the Covenant, Hamilton found it impossible to unite his forces with theirs, and thus the Royalists were divided among themselves. Had it not been for this, they might yet have prevailed. The defeat of Hamilton by the Cromwellian army, and his final surrender at Uxtoxeter, the capture of Colchester by Fairfax (August 27, 1648), and the brutal execution of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, ended the last of the struggles of the unfortunate monarch.

The Commons now resolved to proceed capitally against the king, and on January 2, 1649, sent up their vote to the Lords, declaring it treason for a king

Windsor Castle from the Thames

Whatever may be thought of the apparent weaknesses of his character, it is unanimously agreed that the king's behavior during the closing scenes of his life did the highest honor to his memory, and that he never forgot his part as a Christian, a prince and a soldier. As the head of the illustrious victim fell under the axe a deep groan burst from the assembled multitude. The crowd tried to burst its bounds, and many succeeded in pushing through the soldiers that they might dip their handkerchiefs in the blood of the illustrious prince who had rendered up his life.

The most terrible confusion now followed, and the whole city and all its citizens seemed swayed by the most tremendous emotion. But the Commons did not relax their efforts. A few days later they passed an act abolishing the monarchy and the Lords as useless and antiquated incumbrances, and the form of all public business changed, from being in the king's name to being in that of the Parliament. But unanimity of opinion did not obtain even in that body, for the nobles remained faithful to the monarchical idea, and recognized in the exiled Prince of Wales their rightful sovereign ; while others inveighed against a hireling priesthood, and sought the complete dissolution of the constitution, civil and ecclesiastical, the better, they argued, to facilitate the dominion of Christ, whose second coming they expected.

London was now left without a court. Cromwell

himself, the Lord Protector, was first in Ireland, then in Scotland, conducting military operations for the subjection of those countries, which had, while seeking themselves every possible freedom and liberty, determined to retain the king and the monarchy as a part of state pageantry. Ireland and Scotland having been properly reduced, the Dutch were next to feel the power of British arms. Meanwhile London was the scene of many widely differing dramas. On April 20, 1653, this famous city witnessed the most extraordinary usurpation of authority which the history of England has known. Seeing that the Parliament was now jealous of his power, prestige and privileges, Cromwell had determined by one well-aimed blow to reduce it to complete subjection to his authority, and for this purpose had summoned a general council of officers, which had met on the preceding August 13, and had voted a remonstrance to Parliament. The legislative body having taken this measure, however, in very bad part, and determined, instead of dissolving, to fill the house by new elections, it was then that Cromwell determined to dissolve it by force. He accordingly proceeded there with a body of three hundred soldiers, and entered the building. The scene which followed is almost indescribable for its audacity and nerve. Commencing by addressing Parliament with forced calmness, he ended by loading it with opprobrium and the vilest reproaches for tyranny, robbery and oppression. Then directing one

soldier to seize the mace, he commanded the others to clear the hall, which they did without heeding the remonstrances of the legislators, whom they merely hustled out. This being done, the Lord Protector went out last, locking the door after him, and departed for his lodgings at Whitehall.

This was followed by the establishment by Cromwell of the so-called "Little Parliament," of which Praise-God Barebones was the shining light; but its duties did not last long, and, after about six months, it resigned its "powers" in favor of Cromwell himself, from whom it had itself received them, and thus Cromwell became absolute master of the kingdom, with the sole condition that he should every three years summon a Parliament, the function of which was less to enact laws than perhaps to ratify those which he had promulgated. The scenes which followed the convening of the first of these assemblies are too well known to require comment—scenes which led to the dissolution by Cromwell of that very body which he himself had brought together. But Cromwell did not confine his oppressions to the Parliament of the nation. London was also made to feel the usurper's hand. It was a rude shock, indeed, for the hitherto privileged city to have a couple of regiments ordered to make a descent upon it, and secure all and any moneys that they could find, no less than twenty thousand pounds being secured on one occasion by the very simple method of seizing the coffers of the city

companies. Neither Parliament nor citizens had any right to complain. They had by their conduct called a monster to life, and there was nothing to do but to abide by the consequences. The events of his reign, including the Tunisian incident and the rape of Jamaica, for reign it really was, do not concern the history of the capital city. London, or to be technically accurate, Westminster was, however, to be the scene of his greatest triumph; for here, in the same hall which had witnessed the proceedings against his unfortunate predecessor, Cromwell, who had declined the crown offered by a slavish Parliament in May, 1657, was, on June 26 following, pompously reinstalled in the exercise of his protectorship, "seated in purple and ermine at the upper end of the hall, with a golden sceptre in the right hand, a golden Bible in the other." He did not long, however, enjoy his high honors, for London, which had in June, 1657, witnessed his triumph, fifteen months later witnessed his demise (September 3, 1658).

The events which followed, the recognition of Richard, Cromwell's son, as his successor, his subsequent deposition, the investing of the Committee of Safety with sovereign authority, the efforts of Monk, at the time in command in Scotland, in the king's favor, all these followed each other in rapid succession. After such weary unrest and confusion, the arrival of Monk and his army was hailed by the city with satisfaction, and when on the assembling of the new Parliament,

April 25, 1660—which, from its not being regularly summoned, was called the “Convention Parliament”—a motion was made by King, seconded by Finch, to restore the king, it was greeted with the loudest acclamations and enthusiasm, and thirteen days later, May 6, the palace yard at Whitehall witnessed the solemn proclamation whereby Charles II. ascended the throne of his ancestors.

During all this time London itself had undergone a number of important changes. Like the reign of James I., that of Charles I. cannot be said to be particularly distinguished for its foundations or monuments. The terrible political struggles, and the tremendous emotions by which the whole nation and the city were swayed, did not admit of the very free development of beneficent inclination or commercial initiative. The king had found time and occasion, however, in the earlier years of his reign to grant a number of charters to city companies. Thus the Upholders were the first to successfully solicit a charter from Charles, which they obtained in 1626. The Playing Card Makers obtained theirs three years later, in 1629, and the Clockmakers in 1631. The Glaziers received a charter in 1637, and the Glovers and Gunmakers obtained one in 1638.

A charter of incorporation was also granted by Charles I. to Sion College. This institution, though founded during the reign of his predecessor, in 1623, by Dr. Thomas White, the vicar of St. Dunstan in

the West, as a "college and almshouse," did not obtain royal recognition until the granting of the above mentioned charter in 1630. The "college," as it was called, consisted of all the incumbents of the city of London and its suburbs, and by prescription the suburbs are taken to include not only all the parishes which were actually contiguous to the city walls at the time of the foundation, but also all those which the exigency of later times have caused to be carved out of the same. It was intended and has since remained a kind of clerical club, the governing body of which consists of a president, two deans and four assistants, who are elected annually on the third Tuesday after Easter Tuesday. The library of the college, which is coeval with its foundation, was the gift of Dr. John Simpson, rector of St. Olave, Hart Street, one of the executors under the founder's will, and has always been one of the chief glories of the college. The original buildings at London wall, between Aldermanbury on the east and Philip Lane on the west—the former site of the suppressed Elsyng Hospital—suffered severely from the great fire of 1666. The college library and the almshouse, which was intended to shelter ten old men and ten old women, continued on the same site until 1884, when, with a view of moving the college and its valuable library to a more spacious and suitable building, an act of Parliament was obtained which sanctioned the removal of the institution to its present site on Victoria Embankment. The

work on the new building was commenced almost immediately, and it was formally opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales on December 15, 1886. The same act authorized the abolition of the almshouse, and directed that the alms-folk be granted annuities instead of living in community. The library was at first dependent for the renewal of its supply of books entirely upon voluntary contributions and donations, but the copyright act, Anne 6, c. 7, provided that it should receive one volume of all the books registered at Stationers' Hall. This privilege was taken from the library in 1836, by the 6 and 7 William IV., but a monetary compensation for the purchase of new books granted to it instead. The library and reading room connected with it is open to all fellows of the college or licensed curates of the metropolis, who, for an annual fee of ten shillings and sixpence, can acquire the privilege of borrowing from it for home reading. Incumbents not being fellows pay an annual guinea for the same privileges. The library is also open to the general public for the purpose of consultation during the hours from ten until four o'clock.

But London owes one thing to the early Stuarts which has not yet been mentioned, for it was James I. who, in 1618, preserved, to his credit be it said, the opening of Lincoln's Inn Fields from the all-encroaching builder. As early as 1613 the Lords of the Privy Council wrote to the County Justices to restrain certain building operations in Lincoln's Inn

Fields. James I., however, determined that the fields should be "laid out in walks like Moorfields," and by a patent, dated November 16, 1618, he appointed Francis Bacon and others as a commission to see that the work was properly carried on. The commissioners in their turn appointed Inigo Jones, the then rising architect, to attend to the matter. But the labors of Inigo Jones were not to be confined to gardening, for he next received an order from James himself to commence the reconstruction of Whitehall, which had been seriously damaged in the fire of 1615; but at the outbreak of the civil war the banqueting hall alone had been completed. Jones, who had now risen high in favor, was also employed by George Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham, and favorite of James I., to build for him a splendid mansion, which he called York House, and of which the Watergate, near Charing Cross, is the remaining relic.

Nor was Lincoln's Inn Fields the only square of which Inigo Jones was the architect. Covent Garden, so called from its having originally formed part of the garden of the abbey of Westminster, was also his work. The square was formed about 1631, at the expense of Francis, Earl of Bedford. The arcade ran along the whole of the north and east sides. The west side was formed by the church of St. Paul, of which Inigo Jones was also the architect, while the south side was formed by the garden wall of Bedford House, which faced the Strand. Jones also com-

menced the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, which had become greatly out of repair during the preceding reigns. He never got farther than the portico, however, for the civil war stopped the work, and Jones died before the Restoration. The spirit of the Parliament during the stormy times of the civil war and the Commonwealth was scarcely conducive to the erecting of ecclesiastical edifices, and it will be remembered that the year 1643 witnessed the passing of an act ordering the removal of all the crosses and images from places of public worship, and St. Paul's cross itself and the adjacent pulpit, from which so many famous sermons had been preached, suffered the fate of the others and was pulled down.

St. Paul's, Covent Garden, remained therefore Inigo Jones' sole ecclesiastical achievement of importance. Though begun in 1631 and consecrated in 1638, it was not until 1645 that it was constituted into an independent parish, it having previously been regarded merely as a chapel of ease for St. Martin-in-the-Fields, which parish had been established in 1535. The church of St. Paul, which was constructed at the expense of Francis, Earl of Bedford, is probably the most conspicuous, if not the most valuable, of the works of the famous architect under whose guidance it was erected. Though originally intended to face the square, it was decided, for ecclesiastical reasons, that it must face the other way, so that the altar might occupy the accustomed position. Accordingly,

it backs on the square and faces the west, being accessible from Bedford Street by an open passage. The portico, which had been seriously damaged, was restored at the expense of the Earl of Burlington in 1727, and in 1788 an outer coating of Portland stone was added to the walls, while the rustic gateways, which had been imitated by Jones from Palladio, were rebuilt in stone. In 1888 the outer stone coating was cleared away and the original red brick walls laid to view. The interior was done over and restored in 1872. The eminent persons buried here include Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (died 1645), Sir Henry Herbert, master of the revels under Charles I. (died 1673), Samuel Butler, the author of "Hudibras" (died 1680), Sir Peter Lely, the great painter (died 1680), Dick Estcourt, the actor and noted wit (died 1711), Edward Kynaston, the female impersonator (died 1712), William Wycherly, the dramatist (died 1715), Grinling Gibbons, the sculptor (died 1721), Susannah Centlivre, author of "The Busybody" and "The Wonder," James Worsdale, the painter (died 1767), Charles Macklin, the actor (died 1797), John Wolcot, "Peter Pindar," the author of the "Lousiad" (died 1819), and other celebrities.

The injury to Whitehall during the fire of 1615 had caused the removal of the king and the court to the adjoining palace of St. James, and here it was that a great part of the Stuart reigns were spent. Though altered, remodeled and transformed from a

leper hospital into a palace by Henry VIII., that monarch had always preferred Whitehall, which he had wrested from Wolsey. It may have been that on second thought he inclined rather to succeed that stately prelate than the lepers whom he had sent howling homeless through the streets. Mary, however, held her court at St. James, as the associations of Anne Boleyn's triumphs and her mother's sorrows would have made a residence there altogether too distressing. Elizabeth cut the Gordian knot by spending much of her time at Somerset House, but the Stuarts had a decided preference for St. James, and when not at Hampton Court or Windsor, were usually at their palace on the Mall. The present Mall was then merely a broad walk in the gardens of St. James' Palace, and the Mall so frequently referred to is the present Pall Mall, so named from the fact that it was a place specially set aside for the game of "Palamaglio" or "Paille Maille," a species of croquet which had been introduced from Italy into France in the preceding century, and brought over from France into England in the days of James I. Thus also the name of Birdcage Walk is derived from the aviary which was established in the royal pleasure grounds of St. James, at the place where to-day the walk above mentioned is situated. Charles I. carried the royal gardening and parking further west again, and, while Hyde Park had been set aside as a sort of royal preserve by Henry VIII., and it

is from Anne Hyde, consort of James II., that it derives its present appellation, it obtained something of its present definite form under Charles I., to whom is due the making of that drive which is known to-day as the Ring.

Society had, in the days of the early Stuarts, migrated more than ever to the Strand, and was spreading itself by a gradual process north of that street, into the neighborhood of Covent Garden. But it must not be supposed that fashion had altogether abandoned the older localities, for, in the reign of James I., Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland, lived in great state at the Minories, between Aldgate and Tower Hill; while Lord Cottington and Sir William Cockayne, lord mayor in 1619, had mansions in Old Broad Street, and it was at his residence in the last-named street that the latter gave, during his mayoralty, his great entertainment in honor of James I. Sir Paul Pindar, the merchant prince, lived in Bishopsgate Street. Aldersgate Street also possessed many fine mansions. Here the Marquis of Dorchester resided at Peter House, and the Earl of Thanet at Thanet House. Somewhat further west we find Lady Hatton living side by side with Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, in Ely Place, the site of their many quarrels. Lady Hatton was, in fact, perhaps more famous for her quarrels than for her parties. She was, however, an accomplished woman in more ways than one, and when she entertained usually did

Marble Arch, Hyde Park

it handsomely, receiving many of the best people. Royalty often attended, and in 1617 she was on one occasion honored by the king's presence. Gondomar, her next-door neighbor, was largely feted, wined and dined. Of all the fetes given in his honor, and they were numerous, that which he attended at Sir Arthur Chichester's in 1624 was not perhaps the least noted. Further west again was Brooke House, the residence of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, counsellor to Queen Elizabeth and James I., and a great friend of Sir Philip Sidney. It stood on the north side of the street, a little beyond Furnival's Inn. It had originally been called Bath House, from Bouchier, Earl of Bath, by whom it had been largely altered and in part rebuilt. Here Lord Brooke was murdered by his own servant on December 1, 1628, and his house was leased by the crown and fitted up for the reception of the French ambassador. On Holborn also was Southampton House, the town house of the Wriothesley, Earls of Southampton. It was on the south side of the street, a little above Holborn Bars, and became far-famed for its hospitality. It was taken down in 1552, though a portion was retained as late as 1850 in Griffiths' (the whip-maker) warehouse, while other fragments were retained in the Blue Post Tavern at No. 47 Southampton Buildings. Another great house in the same neighborhood was Weld House, Lincoln's Inn Fields. This was the residence of Sir Edward Stradling, and

was erected by him during the reign of Charles I. The ground on which it stood was called "Oldwicke Close." The place was sold in 1651 to Humphrey Weld, son of Sir Humphrey Weld, lord mayor in 1608, and was thus given the name of Weld House.

On the Strand, besides the houses famous in the days of Elizabeth for entertaining, others now arose. Here Salisbury House, which had only been partly completed when Elizabeth died, now reared its noble facade; here Thomas Cecil, Earl of Exeter, son of the great Lord Burleigh, had erected for himself a splendid mansion, known as Exeter House, on the site of the present Exeter Street. The Earl of Dorset, better known as Thomas Sackville, the poet, lived in Fleet Street, in what had formerly been the town house of the Bishops of Salisbury. Also on the Strand stood Bedford House, the residence of the Earl of Bedford, where the Earl of Rutland, who then resided there, in 1622 entertained Lord Bacon. At the western end of the Strand, near where Northumberland Avenue now issues from Trafalgar Square, stood Northampton House, built in 1605 by Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton. It was by his will left to his nephew, Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk, and continued for some time to be called Suffolk House, though in 1642 it passed, by the marriage of Elizabeth, daughter of the second Earl of Suffolk, with Algernon Percy, tenth Earl of Northumberland, into the possession of the house of

Percy, from which it derived its later name of Northumberland House. Next door resided, in the days of Charles I., Sir Harry Vane, where now stands the Grand Hotel. The house was for many years the residence of the Secretary of State.

Not far from the last-mentioned mansion was Wallingford House, at Whitehall, the splendid residence of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. It stood on the site of the present Admiralty, and derived its name from Sir William Knollys, treasurer of the household of Queen Elizabeth and James I., who was at one and the same time Baron Knollys, Viscount Wallingford and Earl of Banbury. The Duke of Buckingham purchased the house from Lord Wallingford. Here Buckingham's eldest son, the author of "The Rehearsal," was born. It was here that he was residing when he received the appointment of lord high admiral; and on his assassination, August 23, 1628, the young duke being a minor, the "Council of the Sea," or Admiralty Board, continued to be held there. Here also was the lord treasurer's office; and here it was that the Duchess of Buckingham and her new husband, Lord Dunluce, resided after the treasurer's family moved out. Another house famous in social annals was Berkshire House, the town house of the Earls of Berkshire, facing St. James Park, which afterwards became the residence of the celebrated Countess of Castlemaine, later Duchess of Cleveland.

While Covent Garden had not reached the development which it attained later in the century, it already possessed a goodly number of fine mansions. Clare House Court, on the east side of Drury Lane, contained Clare House, the town house of the Earls of Clare. Great Queen Street possessed many fine houses, of which a large part had been designed by Webb, the pupil of Inigo Jones. The houses were at first built on the south side only, but later houses on the north side were also erected. Conde di Oniate, the Spanish ambassador, and Gondomar's successor, resided in Long Acre. In 1635 Leicester Fields, which derives its name from the mansion of the Earls of Leicester, there situated, was converted into a square, though the south side was not closed in until 1671. Tothill and Canon Row, Westminster, retained their popularity, but were regarded as being somewhat remote. Still there were a number of fine houses there, notably the residences of the Earl of Hereford and of the Earl of Cumberland. There also resided the famous Anne, Countess of Dorset. Dorset Court marks the site of Dorset House, just as Derby Street does that of the mansion of the Earls of Derby, and Manchester Buildings that of the houses of the Earls of Lincoln and the Dukes of Manchester.

As regards the popular amusements, they remained much what they had been under the Tudors. One of the great events of the year was still St. James'

Fair, held in the open space near St. James' Palace. This was always held on the eve of St. James' Day, on the day itself, the morrow and the four days following. Permission to hold it had been granted to the hospital by Edward I., and, though prohibited by an act of Parliament, in 1651, on account of the turbulence which it occasioned, the fair was re-established at the Restoration. Besides the booths at which every variety of objects were sold and purchased, there were booths at which every variety of amusement was provided, from cockfights and acrobatic performances to musical comedy and every species of dancing. For cockfighting, however, a special license was required, the issuing of which was the prerogative of the groom porter of the lord chamberlain's department. Cockfighting was, however, by no means limited to booths at St. James' Fair. The royal palace of Whitehall itself had a cockpit attached to it, in the same fashion as billiard rooms are now considered a necessary adjunct to a present-day residence. It was quite customary in the days when Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn held their court at Whitehall for the royal pair and their evening guests to spend a leisurely hour in watching the ancient sport. In the time of Elizabeth, of James I. and Charles I. the cockpit was used as a Theatre Royal, where performances, attended by the monarch, were given, as it was not customary during those reigns for the sovereign to attend a public theatre. When, how-

ever, the place ceased to serve the purpose originally intended does not seem to be clear. The royal cockpit at Whitehall was not the only building devoted to this sport. Another cockpit also much frequented was that which stood by the steps which led from Birdcage Walk into Dartmouth Street, near the top of Queen Street, Westminster. The building was distinguished for its cupola. Hogarth's print of "The Cockpit" gives an excellent idea of the scenes which were daily enacted within the building. The structure remained until 1816, when it was pulled down. It had long since been deserted for the cockpit which had been established behind Gray's Inn.

The Cockpit which had been one of the principal features of Drury Lane during the later Tudor period had, shortly after the accession of James I., been converted into a public playhouse, and had come to be known as the Phoenix Theatre. It was, however, principally devoted to popular performances of not a very high-class character, and had, indeed, attained such disfavor that an attack by the apprentices of London, who had from time immemorial claimed and exercised the right of demolishing all "houses of ill fame," was made upon it during the night of Shrove Tuesday, March 4, 1617, and the property with difficulty protected. It was converted into a schoolhouse in 1647, but the next year returned to its old use. It was finally pulled down in 1649, and a new theatre erected on the site was opened in 1658; and here

subsequently came to be performed the French and Italian opera.

Of the other theatres belonging to the early Stuart reigns, Whitefriars Theatre, the Salisbury Court Theatre and the so-called Duke's Theatre in Dorset Gardens were the most noted and popular. The first mentioned, which was none other than the refectory of the dissolved Whitefriars monastery, stood without the garden wall of Salisbury, or Dorset, House, the old inn or hostelry of the Bishops of Salisbury. The patent which mentions Whitefriars as a theatre bears the date 1610, though it has been asserted that plays were acted in Whitefriars Hall, before it was turned into a theatre, as early as 1580. The second—namely, the Salisbury Court Theatre—was in Salisbury Court itself, off Fleet Street. It was originally the barn, or granary, at the lower end of the great backyard of Salisbury House itself, but was in 1629 turned into a theatre by those noted actors, Grinnell and Blagrove. In 1652 it was bought by Beeston, the actor, who practically rebuilt it, and opened it in 1660. It was here that Davenant and his company played for some little time, leaving the Cockpit, and until the new theatre in Portugal Row was ready to receive them. The building suffered destruction in the great fire, and was never rebuilt. The third—that is, the Dorset Gardens Theatre—stood in Dorset, near Fleet Street, so named after Dorset House, and so called the Dorset Gardens from the fact that it stood in what had

been the gardens of that mansion. The theatre fronted the river on the east, or city, side of Salisbury Court, and had an open space before it for the accommodation of coaches, while a stone stairway led down to the Thames for the convenience of those who came in barges on the river. Opposite, on the Surrey side of the Thames, the Hope, at Bankside, Southwark, was perhaps the most noted. It had been built in 1613 by Henslow, and opened by him as a bear garden, but was so constructed with a movable stage as to be easily adapted for the acting of plays. Jonson's "Bartholomew's Fair" was first brought out here, and here it was that Taylor, the "water poet," challenged Fennor "to answer him at a trial of wit."

The tavern of this time was still simply the public house, "where rough joke and brawl did flourish," and not the debating club of the later Stuart and the Georgian period. As an institution, however, the tavern was none the less popular. Among the most noted of these resorts Garraway's Coffee House, Change Alley, Cornhill, and the Mermaid Tavern, in Bread Street, Cheap, had attained perhaps a special celebrity. The first of these establishments owes its foundation to one Thomas Garraway, or Garway, a tobacconist and coffee merchant, and obtained its original celebrity as the first shop in London city where tea was sold and dispensed, Garraway himself being loud in his praise of the new beverage, which he claimed alleviated all pain and cured all possible

disorders. In fact, the place may be said, notwithstanding that it retained its appellation of "coffee house," to have been the first "tea room" in London. But Garraway did not limit himself to the sale of either tea or coffee, for his establishment was also widely known for its large and excellent stock of "cherry wine," and also as a general lunch room, where sandwiches, punch and pale ale were also obtainable. The Mermaid Tavern, in Bread Street, Cheap, was the favorite resort of a number of Shakespeare's disciples, much affected by Ben Jonson and his friends, and by him celebrated in verse. The tavern was in existence as early as the first decades of the preceding century, and the "Pastime of the People" (folio 1529) is described as "copyled and emprynted in Chepesyde, at the Sygne of the Mearmayd, next to Polly's Gate." It was here that John Rashell, the printer, brother-in-law of Sir Thomas More, lived and plied his trade. Old Fish Street was also famous for its public houses. There stood the tavern of the King's Head, with the effigy of Henry VII. as its signboard, while in the Beaufroy collection, at the Guildhall, is the signboard of the Will Somers' Tavern, which also stood in Old Fish Street, and which bears the likeness of Will Somers, court jester to Henry VIII., while still another of the Old Fish Street taverns was dedicated to the sign of Cardinal Wolsey. The Boar's Head and the Swan, also in Old Fish Street, were both celebrated

in their day, and both are commemorated in the "Newes from St. Bartholomew Fayre."

Westward of the city walls the first tavern of note to attract the passer-by, on leaving Ludgate, was that famous establishment dedicated to the sign of "La Belle Sauvage." Here in a back room plays were acted and other entertainments provided for the amusement of the guests. The origin of the name has given ground for interesting and prolonged dispute between learned antiquaries. The "Spectator" speaks of the name as derived from an old metrical romance translated out of the French, which romance tells the tale of a beautiful woman found in a wilderness, who is referred to in the French version as "la belle sauvage," a name given also to the English translation. Though accepted by Pennant as the accurate derivation, it seems perhaps a little far-fetched, the more especially as the romance referred to cannot be said to have ever been popular. Thus the derivation given by Douce, who claims that the beautiful savage in question was none other than Solomon's friend, the Queen of Sheba, who in the metrical romance of Alexander—attributed to Alexander Davie, and which appeared in the beginning of the fourteenth century—is spoken of as "sibely sauvage," said by Douce to be a corruption of "si belle sauvage," seems equally remote and improbable. An argument in favor of this last named derivation is that the Queen of Sheba seems quite as well suited

to the purpose of a tavern sign as the Three Wise Men, which was the token of several inns and taverns, and that there was, in fact, in Gracechurch Street a tavern actually dedicated to "La Reine de Saba."

Akerman, in his "Tradesmen Tokens," gives, however, a representation of the sign as that of an Indian girl holding a bow and arrow, from which the idea gained a certain degree of popular credence that the "belle sauvage" in question was none other than the far-famed Pocahontas; but Burn denies the correctness of Akerman's representation, and ascribes his mistake in the matter to the confusion arising from the fact that an armed Indian woman appears as the sinister supporter in the armorial bearings of the Distillers Company. It will be remembered that after the Smith rescuing episode, so dear to the Virginian historiograph, Pocahontas had become a Christian, married a certain John Ralph, and accompanied him to England. Learning of her services, Anne of Denmark, the illustrious consort of James I., commanded that she be presented to her, and the Indian girl, who was the daughter of the noted chief Powhatan, figured quite prominently for a brief period on the stage of London society, and was loaded by the queen with marks of the royal appreciation and gratitude. She was on the point of embarking for America when she died at Gravesend, in 1617, and was there buried. It has been held not unlikely, therefore, that a tavern which rose to a certain celebrity at about

this time should have been accorded the sign of "La Belle Sauvage" in compliment to the popular heroine of the day. It is, at any rate, a pretty story, and as such is given here.

Pegge has it, on the other hand, that the name of the tavern originated in that of an early hostess, a certain Isabella Savage, whose name is said to appear on an old lease of the premises. Other authorities, however, declare in favor of still another story, maintaining that the place was originally known as the Bell, but that it came later to be known as Savage's Inn, from the fact that at one time its proprietor bore that name, and that by a conjunction of the two designations arose the name which has been the cause of so much controversy and discussion. Reference is also made to a tavern of that name by Lambarde, who, writing before 1576, of "the treble oblation, first to the Confessor, then to Sainct Runwald, and lastly to the gracious Roode," remarks that without it "the poor pilgrims could not assure themselves any good, gained by all their labors, no more than such as go to Paris Garden, the Bell Savage, or Theatre, can account of any pleasant spectacle, unless they first pay one pennie at the gate, another at the entrie of the scaffold, and a third for a quiet standing." This would undoubtedly go to show that a tavern dedicated to the Bell Savage, presumably identical with "La Belle Sauvage," existed already in Tudor days, long previous to the accession of the Stuarts, and would

seem thus effectively to dispose of the Pocahontas story. Those in favor of the story, however, advance the opinion that the tavern referred to by Lambarde had no connection with the one which subsequently came to be known as "La Belle Sauvage," and assert, moreover, that that tavern was in Tudor times known as the "Sign of the Rose," basing their statement on the evidence afforded by the will of one John Craythorne, who in the year 1558 bequeathed "the house, together with his own messuage," to the Cutlers Company. The will, however, would go to show that it was his "own messuage," and not "the house," by which presumably is meant the tavern which went by the name of the "Sign of the Rose." Be this as it may, the gift was gratefully accepted by the Cutlers Company, and two exhibitions at Oxford and one at Cambridge, besides certain gifts to the poor of St. Bride's, are still provided out of the bequest. The Pocahontas story is further discredited by the statement of Stow, and other authorities assert that it was at the "Bell Savage" that, in Queen Mary's reign, Sir Thomas Wyatt was stopped in his ill-planned rebellion. Later, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the place became temporarily a school of defence, and here Bankes exhibited his horse Marocco, whose extraordinary accomplishments gave rise to the publication of that wonderful pamphlet, "*Maroccus Extaticus*."

The Devil's Tavern, at Temple Bar, was another

tavern of great celebrity. It stood between Temple Bar and Middle Temple Gate, and the church of St. Dunstan in the West, which was nearly opposite, probably gave the tavern its original appellation of St. Dunstan's Tavern. The sign, however, represented St. Dunstan pulling the devil by the nose, and, that more popular personage soon eclipsing his saintly companion, his name soon became that by which the tavern came to be known. The principal chamber was called the Apollo. Here Ben Jonson, with his followers, often held his court, just as Dryden did later on at Wills', and Addison at Button's. The landlord of the Devil's Tavern, in the days of Jonson, was Simon Wadloe, the original of "Old Sir Simeon the King," the favorite air of Squire Western, in "Tom Jones," and possibly an ancestor of "Simple Simon" of nursery ballad fame. The rules of the club or "*leges convivales*," for club it practically came to be, were drawn up by Jonson himself in the most elegant Latin, and graven in gold letters in the marble over the chimney-piece. They were probably drawn up in 1624, and are the predecessors of modern club by-laws. It was at the Devil's Tavern that Killigrew laid the scene of "The Parson's Wedding." It is frequently alluded to by Jonson in his writings, and is also referred to in Rowley's "A Match at Midnight." After the meetings of the Royal Society at Arundel House, it was not unusual for the president and members to adjourn for supper and more con-

vivial talk to the Devil's Tavern, and here on March 18, 1703, occurred the memorable sale of the jewels of the Duchess of Richmond, better known as "la Belle Stuart." In 1746 the Royal Society, which had been holding their dinners at Pontack's, in Abchurch Lane, removed their dining-place by formal vote to the "Devil Tavern at Temple Bar," and some years later, in 1751, Dr. Johnson is, like his earlier namesake, recorded as "making a night of it" at the Devil's Tavern. The Apollo Hall was used for concerts in 1752, while some years later, in 1774, Dr. Kenrick used it for his Shakespearean lectures. In 1775 it was again turned into a concert hall, and the year following became the meeting-place of the Pandemonium Club. In 1787 the building was torn down, and no vestige now remains of this once famous hostelry. Childs' Bank stands, in fact, on the exact site. A representation of the Devil's Tavern, as it was in Hogarth's time, appears among his Hudibras prints, though unfortunately, from a reversal of the drawing, the house seems on the wrong side of the way. A more correct view, therefore, is to be had in the print of Temple Bar, after Wale, in Dodsley's "London," Vol. I., 1761.

The Swan, at Charing Cross, was much in favor as a sort of half-way house between London town and St. James, and the drawer of this famous hostelry, a certain Ralph by name, was introduced by Jonson in the *extempore* grace which that facetious wit and

dramatist composed for "King James." In High Holborn the Blue Boar Inn as early as 1616 had earned for itself well-deserved popularity as the best "stopping-place" on the road from Newgate; while Taylor's Tavern and Wills' Coffee House were the special favorites of the region around Covent Garden. The former stood in Phoenix Alley, out of Long Acre, now Hanover Court, the passage next west to Bow Street, and derived its name from one John Taylor, the "water poet," who ran the establishment, though in reality the tavern was formerly designated first as at the sign of the Mourning Crown, and later as at the sign of the Poet's Head, his own effigy appearing as the signboard, with beneath it the following inscription: "There's many a head stands for a sign; then, gentle reader, why not mine?" Wills' Coffee House, on the other hand, was in Bow Street itself, and stood on the west side of that renowned thoroughfare, at the corner of Russell Street, and was so called from one William Urwin, by whom it was kept. The original sign of the house, Scott tells us, had been a Crow, but had been changed in Dryden's time to a Rose. In this statement it is evident that confusion exists between Wills' establishment and the Rose Tavern, which is on the south side of Russell Street, at the corner of Brydges Street. The change from the Crow to the Rose seems also doubtful, and if such a change was made, it must have been made before Dryden's time. Whatever may be the truth about this, that

establishment which went by the name of Wills' had attained great celebrity in the days of the last-named poet, and here it was that Dryden sat and held his court of followers, just as Jonson had done at the Devil's. Macaulay gives us a delightful description of these literary revels, and mention is made of this famous tavern in a vast mass of literature, and allusions to it appear in the "Spectator," the "Tattler," in Pepys, in Pope, in Jonson, and in others too numerous to name.

In Westminster the Dog, the Leg, the Turk's Head and Miles' Coffee House were perhaps the most noted. The first mentioned was somewhere between Whitehall and Westminster Hall. Here Pepys and some of his friends frequently dined, as did other celebrities. The Leg Tavern was in King Street, Westminster, and was a house in decidedly good favor. The sign was undoubtedly derived from the sign used by cobblers and bootmakers, and it was of those that the tightly-fitting boots and stockings gave rise to Falstaff's famous simile. The Turk's Head is described as "the next house to the stairs," New Palace Yard, Westminster. Here the famous Rota Club, of which Cyriac Skinner, Major Wildman and Sir William Petty were prominent members, held its meetings. For them a large oval table was made, around which sat Harrington and his virtuosi, while Miles, the landlord, delivered his coffee from a passageway which had been arranged down the centre.

Of suburban inns, the Angel, at Islington, and the Elephant and Castle, on the Surrey side of the river, were perhaps the most noted. The former, though commonly spoken of as being in Islington, was really in the parish of Clerkenwell. It was built by one William Ryplingham in 1638, and soon rose to great popularity as a halting-place for the traveller approaching London from the north. Here it was usual for them to spend the night, if they arrived after sundown, as the road between the inn and the city was infested with thieves, who not only assaulted and robbed their victims with impunity, but often murdered them, if resistance was made. It was therefore usual for travellers crossing the fields to Clerkenwell to proceed in a body for mutual protection, and the bell of the Angel was rung at certain hours of departure to bring such parties together. The inn is still in existence, but has been much altered and modernized in the course of centuries. But if the Angel ranked first among suburban inns to the north of London, that celebrated hostelry, the Elephant and Castle, was the most famous of suburban inns on the Surrey side, for the Tabard had seen its best days. Situated at Walworth, about a mile and a half from Westminster, and at an equal distance from Blackfriars, it stood where the Kennington, Walworth and New Kent Roads meet, and was therefore at the centre, as it were, of the highways to important places in Kent and Surrey. It soon became well

known for its welcome and good cheer, and but few travellers going southward out of London failed to stop thereat and refresh themselves. Like that of "La Belle Sauvage," its name has given rise to singular speculations. It has been a theory, warmly urged by some antiquaries, that the name of the inn was in the first instance the "Infanta del Castillo," so called in honor of the Infanta Maria Althea, second daughter of Philip III. of Spain, to whom Prince Charles, afterwards Charles I., was at one time affianced. The elephant, with or without the howdah or castle upon its back, was, however, not uncommonly pictured, and might therefore have just as easily been selected for a tavern sign as the goat, the green dragon or the red lion. That a tavern should be named after a Spanish Infanta who had never visited England, even though we consider her promised connection with the country, and the great and evident effort made by the court to honor and popularize everything Spanish, seems, to say the least, improbable. It may also be added that the elephant and castle—that is, the elephant with a castle or howdah upon its back—appears as the crest in the armorial bearings of the Cutlers Company, and might thus easily have come to be used as a tavern sign by one in some way connected with the company, or in the case of a tavern built on land either belonging to or contiguous to land which was the property of the Cutlers Company.

Besides the theatres and other places of regular

entertainment, there were other rendezvous, the most noted of which, perhaps, was the king's Spring Gardens at Whitehall. These gardens were situated between St. James Park and Charing Cross, and appertained properly to the king's palace at Whitehall. They formed part of the royal domain, and derived their name from a jet or spring of water, "which," it is said, "sprung with the pressure of the foot, and wetted whosoever was foolish or ignorant enough to tread upon it." They contained butts, a pheasant yard, a bathing pond and bowling green, and from the fact that, like a number of the royal parks of the present day, they were open to the general public save on some special occasion, they partook at once of a semi-private and semi-public character. At the Restoration the gardens were closed and the land built upon, and only the name survives to-day in the locality as that of the passage leading from Trafalgar Square into St. James Park, which thoroughfare and its immediate vicinity has been inhabited by many distinguished residents.

It was not, however, to be supposed that the public would be content to be thus deprived of the privileges and amusements to which it had become accustomed. The need of some new place where similar entertainments could be enjoyed was now so keenly felt that the opening of Vauxhall, at Lambeth—a public pay garden, where promenade concerts, fireworks and other festivities were held—was the result; nor did

this suffice. Two other well-known rendezvous, where gaming and bowling were the main attractions, were opened "in the fields behind the Muse" (Mews), and came to be known respectively as Piccadilly Hall and Shaver's Hall. The former had been the property of one Robert Barker, of the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, and was sold by his widow to Colonel Panton, whose name is preserved to us in Panton Street, just as Coventry Street preserves to us the name of Mr. Secretary Coventry, of the reign of Charles II. The house became a place of public meeting, where gaming and drinking were the chief distractions. Sir John Suckling, the poet, was one of the greatest habitués of the place, and a story is related of his sisters coming down to "Piccadilly bowling green" to entreat him not to lose all their portions. The situation of Piccadilly Hall seems to have been ascertained to have been at the northeast corner of the Haymarket and Coventry Streets. Opposite, on the south side of Coventry, between the Haymarket and Hedge Lane, stood Shaver's Hall, also a noted gaming house and place of public resort. It was erected by a gentleman barber in the service of Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. Both Piccadilly Hall and Shaver's Hall were the favorite resorts of the fast world, and the rooms of these establishments were nightly the scene of gay and brilliant gatherings. Nor has the locality changed much in respect to its character, for Piccadilly Circus is still

to-day the centre of whatever "life of the boulevard" London possesses.

Whatever the streets in the early Stuart reigns may have lacked in breadth and modern traffic—and they were in many cases at once narrow, dark and tortuous—they possessed much picturesqueness and general interest, as well human as architectural, and not a little of that interest was in that luxurious mode of conveyance, the sedan chair, great numbers of which were forever passing and repassing, that their noble occupants might be carried hither and thither to their various destinations. But the sedan chair was already, so to speak, a doomed article of furniture, for most persons of rank and fashion had, besides, their equipages, and the year 1650 witnessed what was almost a revolution in the matter of public conveyance; for that year, it is recorded, one Captain Bailey, "who hath been a sea captain, but now lives on the land about the city, where he tries experiments, hath erected, according to his ability, some four hackney coaches, put his men in livery and appointed them to stand at the Maypole in the Strand, giving them instructions at what rates to carry men into several parts of the town, where all day they may be had." Thus was the first stand of public coaches established. When one sees the immense number of different forms of public conveyances which now crowd the London streets, it seems perhaps difficult to believe that there could have been a time when the hansom

cab and the four-wheeler did not exist. The Maypole to which reference is made is not that at St. Andrew's, from which that church came to be designated as "Undershaft," for after the turbulent episode of 1519 the Maypole festivities at St. Mary Axe were discontinued. The one referred to was that which it was customary to erect at St. Mary le Strand, the open space in front of which was the centre of the popular rejoicings.

The illustrious names of the first two Stuart reigns are not so numerous as those which figured in the years of Elizabeth, yet many there were who were worthy both of lasting fame and of gracing the royal circle. Who more so than Sir Kenelm Digby, that *preux chevalier* of the first Charles' court, who, though he lost much by his time-servingness under the Protectorate, combines so well the graces of society and the polished elegance of the best literary style? But while Digby was indulging in an inquiry into the nature of "Bodies" and "Peripatetic Institutions," Herrick was writing poems on the feats of forest fairies and Milton was enlarging on the regrets of him to whom "Paradise is Lost," and the happiness of him to whom "Paradise is Regained." Of dramatists, there were Thomas Killigrew, Massinger, James Shirley and others of lesser light, while the poets, besides the bards already here before referred to, numbered Drayton, of "Poly-Olbion" fame, George Wither, Cowley and Sir John Suckling. Of anti-

quaries there were many, including Selden, so celebrated for his "Table Talk," Spelman, Fuller, Somner and Sir William Dugdale. Two somewhat opposite, but equally famous, men were Harvey, who discovered that "the blood of man doth circulate," and Isaak Walton, to whom angling was both sport and science. Of English painters there were none of import, but the lack was amply made up by the presence at the English court of Van Dyck, Remigius von Limput and Daniel Mytens. To these should be added Inigo Jones, that noted architect, to whom the London of the early Stuart period is so largely indebted; Edward Alleyn, the actor, who founded Dulwich Hospital; Robert Fludd, the alchemist, and Archbishop Usher, to whom we owe the usually adopted form of biblical chronology. All these were more or less associated with London history, and belong therefore to London annals.





